

STATE OF LOUISIANA LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR

**Adult and Juvenile Correctional
Facilities in Louisiana**

March 2000



Performance Audit

Daniel G. Kyle, Ph.D., CPA, CFE
Legislative Auditor

LEGISLATIVE AUDIT ADVISORY COUNCIL

MEMBERS

Representative Edwin R. Murray, Chairman
Senator J. "Tom" Schedler, Vice Chairman

Senator Robert J. Barham
Senator Foster L. Campbell, Jr.
Senator Lynn B. Dean
Senator Willie L. Mount
Representative Rick Farrar
Representative Victor T. Stelly
Representative T. Taylor Townsend
Representative Warren J. Triche, Jr.

LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR

Daniel G. Kyle, Ph.D., CPA, CFE

DIRECTOR OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT

David K. Greer, CPA, CFE

This document is produced by the Legislative Auditor, State of Louisiana, Post Office Box 94397, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-9397 in accordance with Louisiana Revised Statute 24:513. One hundred copies of this public document were produced at an approximate cost of \$1,100.00. This material was produced in accordance with the standards for state agencies established pursuant to R.S. 43:31. An executive summary of this document is available on the Legislative Auditor's Web site at www.la.state.la.us.

In compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance relative to this document, or any documents of the Legislative Auditor, please contact Wayne "Skip" Irwin, Director of Administration, at 225/339-3800.

Adult and Juvenile Correctional Facilities in Louisiana

March 2000



**Performance Audit
Office of the Legislative Auditor
State of Louisiana**

**Daniel G. Kyle, Ph.D., CPA, CFE
Legislative Auditor**

Table of Contents

Legislative Auditor’s Transmittal Letter	ix
Executive Summary	xi
Chapter 1: Introduction	
Initiation and Objectives	1
Report Conclusions	2
Scope and Methodology	9
Areas for Further Study	14
Facility Name Abbreviations	14
Report Organization.....	15
Chapter 2: Projections for Adult and Juvenile Correctional Populations	
Chapter Conclusions	17
National and Louisiana Figures Show Increase in Adult Prison Population.....	18
Adult Inmate Population in the Southern States Has More Than Doubled	18
Louisiana's Inmate Population in State Facilities Increased by 57 Percent in 10 Years	19
Slight Secure Juvenile Population Increase Projected	20
9,840 Adult Inmate Beds Needed in Next Four Years to Stay Near Maximum Inmate Capacity.....	21
Growth of Inmate Population Could Cost the State an Additional \$122 Million.....	21
Chapter 3: Analysis of State Correctional Facility Costs	
Chapter Conclusions	25
Housing State Adult and Juvenile Offenders Costs \$400 Million.....	27
Incarceration Represents 77 Percent of Prison Costs.....	29
Administrative Expense for All Inmates Averages \$3.13 Per Day.....	32
Health Expense for All Inmates Is \$4.39 Per Day	34
Rehabilitation Expense for All Inmates Is \$0.50 Per Day	36
DOC's Cost Data Do Not Reflect All Costs of Operating a Facility	39

Chapter 3: Analysis of State Correctional Facility Costs (Cont.)

LSU Medical Center System Spends Millions to Care for Incarcerated39

Housing a Juvenile Costs More Than \$72 Per Day41

DOC Spends Less for Juvenile Incarceration Than for Adult Incarceration43

Incarceration Expense for Juveniles Averages \$44.57 Per Day44

Administrative Expense Averages \$9.37 Per Day for
Each Juvenile Offender44

Administrative Costs Declined in Fiscal Year 1998-9945

Health Expense Averages \$10.95 Per Day for Each Juvenile Offender46

DOC’s Rehabilitation Expense Averages \$7.97 Per Day for Each Juvenile47

DOC Contracted for Operation of Tallulah and Jena48

Contractors Must Comply With ACA Standards.....50

DOC to Pay an Annual Per Diem Increase50

State Pays for Charity Hospital Care and Certain Security Costs50

Local School Board Shared Education Expenses With Jena Contractor51

DOC Still Obligated in the Event of Facility Takeover.....51

Factors That Impact a Facility's Operating Expenses52

Physical Plant Layout Impacts Incarceration Costs54

Economies of Scale Can Affect Administration Costs55

Chapter 4: Comparison of State (Privately and Publicly Operated) Adult Correctional Facilities

Chapter Conclusions57

A Comparison of Medium Security Prisons58

Allen Has the Lowest Cost Per Inmate Per Day60

Staffing Level Higher at State Facility60

Private Facilities Have Lower Medical Costs.....61

Avoyelles Has a Larger Medical Staff Than Private Facilities.....62

Avoyelles Has More Patient Contacts Than Do Private Facilities63

Winn Has More Rehabilitation Staff Than Allen or Avoyelles.....65

Private Prisons Have Much Lower Security Costs68

Private Facilities Have Fewer Correctional Officers68

Winn Has the Highest Administrative Costs69

Chapter 4: Comparison of State (Privately and Publicly Operated) Adult Correctional Facilities (Cont.)

Physical Plant Characteristics Are Similar	70
Building New Prison Could Provide Savings.....	71
Contractual Arrangements With Allen and Winn.....	71
Contractors Must Comply With ACA Standards.....	72
DOC Is Required to Pay the Contractors a Per Diem	72
State Pays for Inmate Charity Hospital Care	73
Contractor Must Provide Education Programs and Minimum Number of Security Positions	73
Contractors Are Required to Hold State Harmless	74

Chapter 5: Housing of State Inmates in Local Facilities

Chapter Conclusions	75
Louisiana Houses Many State Inmates in Local Facilities.. ..	76
Louisiana Accounted for One-Third of State Inmates in Local Jails.....	78
Use of Local Jails Is Cheaper.....	79
Local Sheriffs Determine Where Inmates Are Housed.....	80
State Inmates May Receive Inadequate Screening Services.....	81
Local Facilities' Rehabilitation Less Extensive.....	83
DOC's Oversight of State Inmates in Local Facilities	86
Inmate Location and Billing Verification	88
Incomplete Performance Data Presented in the Executive Budget.....	89
Cost Information Not Reported for State Inmates	91

Chapter 6: Rehabilitation and Recidivism

Chapter Conclusions	95
DOC and the Vo-Tech System Spent \$6 Million on Rehabilitation in Fiscal Year 1998-99	97
DOC Recently Began to Compile Recidivism Data for Rehabilitation Programs	97
Recidivism: Background Data	99
Rehabilitation Programs: No Consensus About Their Impact on Recidivism	100

Chapter 6: Rehabilitation and Recidivism (Cont.)

Drug Treatment Programs May Reduce Recidivism	100
Sex Offender Programs May Have a Small Impact on Recidivism.....	101
Impact of Education Programs Is Uncertain	101
Impact of Prison Industry Programs on Recidivism Is Unclear.....	102
Minnesota Provides Little Support for the Value of Rehabilitation Programs in Reducing Recidivism.....	102
Rehabilitation Might Help Control Growth of Inmates.....	103
Louisiana's Recidivism Rate Is Average.....	104
Louisiana Ranks Low in Rehabilitation Spending.....	106
Recidivism Effect of Hunt's Boot Camp Program Is Questionable.....	107
Two Louisiana Studies Suggest the Value of Rehabilitation Programs	109
Study Found Better Recidivism and Employment Results for Program Participants.....	110
LCIW Study Concludes That Education Programs Reduce Recidivism	110

Exhibits

Exhibit 2-1: Growth of Adult Inmate Population in State Facilities.....	19
Exhibit 2-2: Projected Adult Inmate Population in State Facilities	20
Exhibit 2-3: Increased Costs Associated With the Addition of Adult Inmate Beds	22
Exhibit 3-1: Louisiana's Adult Correctional Facilities--Direct Operating Expenditures.....	28
Exhibit 3-2: Louisiana's Adult Correctional Institutions--Administration, Incarceration, Rehabilitation, and Health Costs	30
Exhibit 3-3: Incarceration Costs at Louisiana's Adult Correctional Facilities	31
Exhibit 3-4: Administrative Costs at Louisiana's Adult Correctional Facilities	33
Exhibit 3-5: DOC's Health Costs at Louisiana's Adult Correctional Facilities	35
Exhibit 3-6: DOC Rehabilitation Costs at Louisiana's Adult Correctional Facilities	38

Exhibits (Cont.)

Exhibit 3-7:	Direct Operating Costs of Louisiana's Juvenile Correctional Facilities	42
Exhibit 3-8:	Louisiana's Juvenile Correctional Facility Costs-- Administration, Incarceration, Rehabilitation, and Health.....	43
Exhibit 3-9:	Incarceration Costs at Louisiana's Juvenile Correctional Facilities	44
Exhibit 3-10:	Administrative Costs at Louisiana's Juvenile Correctional Facilities	45
Exhibit 3-11:	Health Care Costs at Louisiana's Juvenile Correctional Facilities	46
Exhibit 3-12:	Rehabilitation Costs--Louisiana's Juvenile Correctional Facilities	48
Exhibit 3-13:	Percentage of Cells and Dormitories at Louisiana's Adult Correctional Facilities	54
Exhibit 4-1:	Expenditures, Inmate Population, and Staff Population	59
Exhibit 4-2:	Medical Expenditures	61
Exhibit 4-3:	Medical Staffing.....	62
Exhibit 4-4:	Average Number of Monthly Inmate Medical Contacts.....	64
Exhibit 4-5:	Correctional Facility Rehabilitation Staff.....	65
Exhibit 4-6:	Rehabilitation Expenditures.....	66
Exhibit 4-7:	Rehabilitation Programs Offered	67
Exhibit 4-8:	Incarceration Expenditures	68
Exhibit 4-9:	Correctional Facility Security	69
Exhibit 4-10:	Administration Expenditures	70
Exhibit 4-11:	Physical Plant Information.....	70
Exhibit 5-1:	State Inmates Housed in State and Local Jails.....	79
Exhibit 6-1:	Louisiana's Prison Rehabilitation Expenditures DOC and Louisiana Community and Technical College System	99
Exhibit 6-2:	Adult Recidivism Rates in Louisiana	104
Exhibit 6-3:	Percentage of Inmates Enrolled in Rehabilitation Programs Louisiana and Southern Legislative Conference States	106
Exhibit 6-4:	Recidivism Rates of LCIW Education Course Completers and Non-Participants.....	111

Appendices

Appendix A: Analysis of Operating Costs of Adult and Juvenile FacilitiesA.1

Appendix B: Comparison of Costs, Services, and Staffing
at Winn, Allen, and Avoyelles.....B.1

Appendix C: A List of Sheriffs and Local Facilities Receiving
and Responding to Cost Template Mailouts..... C.1

Appendix D: Department of Public Safety and Corrections,
Corrections Services' ResponseD.1



OFFICE OF
LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR
STATE OF LOUISIANA
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70804-9397

1600 NORTH THIRD STREET
POST OFFICE BOX 94397
TELEPHONE: (225) 339-3800
FACSIMILE: (225) 339-3870

DANIEL G. KYLE, PH.D., CPA, CFE
LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR

March 8, 2000

The Honorable John J. Hainkel, Jr.,
President of the Senate
The Honorable Charles W. DeWitt, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives

Dear Senator Hainkel and Representative DeWitt:

During the 1999 Regular Session of the Legislature, the House of Representatives enacted House Concurrent Resolution Number 43. This resolution requested the Legislative Auditor to conduct a study and comparison of state-operated correctional and privately operated facilities in Louisiana to determine the overall effectiveness and efficiency of each. In addition, the resolution requested the Legislative Auditor to look at the operating costs, types and quality of services, recidivism rates, and security concerns.

This is our report titled "Adult and Juvenile Correctional Centers in Louisiana." The audit was conducted under the provisions of Title 24 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950, as amended.

The report presents our findings, conclusions, and recommendations. We have also identified matters for legislative consideration. Included in Appendix D is the response of the Department of Public Safety and Corrections, Corrections Services.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Daniel G. Kyle".

Daniel G. Kyle, CPA, CFE
Legislative Auditor

DGK/dl

[AJCF]



Office of Legislative Auditor

Executive Summary

Performance Audit

Adult and Juvenile Correctional Facilities in Louisiana

In fiscal year 1998-99 the Department of Corrections' (DOC's) operational expenditures for the housing of adult and juvenile offenders in state correctional facilities and local jails were almost \$400 million. In this audit, we analyzed operating costs for DOC's adult and juvenile correctional facilities. We compared the services offered at three nearly identical prisons. We examined the effect of rehabilitation programs on recidivism, and we also reviewed Louisiana's practice of housing state inmates in local jails. We found that:

- Louisiana's adult inmate population is projected to increase by approximately 9,000 inmates from 1999 to mid-2003. To house this increased population, the capital and operating costs to Louisiana over this four-year period are projected to exceed \$122 million.
- To house an offender in a state correctional facility, DOC had average daily operational expenditures of \$35.04 and \$72.86 per adult and juvenile offender, respectively, in fiscal year 1998-99. These expenditures do not include certain administrative, capital and other costs associated with incarcerating offenders. Incarceration costs (housing, securing, feeding, and clothing of inmates) comprised almost 77 percent of DOC's adult prison operating costs.
- Louisiana has three nearly identical correctional facilities, which are Allen, Avoyelles, and Winn Correctional Centers. Allen and Winn are privately managed. In fiscal year 1998-99, including expenditures by the Louisiana Community and Technical College System for vocational-rehabilitation programs, the operational expenditures for Allen were \$26.08 per inmate per day, \$26.44 for Avoyelles and \$27.02 for Winn. The privately managed facilities have smaller total staffs than Avoyelles. Avoyelles has more full-time medical staff and provides more patient contacts than the two private facilities. Winn has more rehabilitation staff and offers more vocational-technical courses than the other two facilities.
- There is no consensus among researchers as to whether rehabilitation programs reduce recidivism rates. We found little difference in recidivism rates between Louisiana, which spends relatively little (\$6 million) on adult rehabilitation programs and Minnesota, which places great emphasis on these programs.
- Louisiana houses more than 40 percent of its state inmates in local jails, which saves the state money compared with the costs at state facilities. However, inmates housed locally generally do not go through a diagnostic and classification process comparable to DOC's to determine their medical, rehabilitation and other needs. Also, the rehabilitation programs provided at local jails are generally not as extensive as those offered in state prisons.

**Audit
Initiation
and
Objectives**

We conducted this performance audit in response to House Concurrent Resolution Number 43 of the 1999 Regular Session. This resolution requested the Legislative Auditor to conduct a study and comparison of state-operated and privately operated correctional facilities in Louisiana to determine the overall effectiveness and efficiency of each. In addition, the resolution requested the Legislative Auditor to look at operating costs, types and quality of services, recidivism rates, and security concerns.

The primary objectives of this audit were to:

- ♦ Analyze the operating costs for DOC's adult and juvenile correctional facilities for fiscal years 1997-98 and 1998-99
- ♦ Compare the operational costs and the services rendered at three nearly identical prisons: the state-operated Avoyelles Correctional Center and the privately operated Allen Correctional Center and Winn Correctional Center
- ♦ Determine recidivism rates in Louisiana and assess the effect of rehabilitation programs on recidivism
- ♦ Determine projected adult inmate and juvenile offender population growth and associated growth in state expenditures
- ♦ Analyze the operating costs for local jails in Louisiana that housed DOC adult inmates for fiscal years 1997-98 and 1998-99
- ♦ Examine the process of housing state inmates in local jails, and compare Louisiana's practices with other states and also, compare services provided to state inmates in local jails with services offered in DOC facilities

**DOC Projects an
Increase in Adult
Prison Population**

Louisiana's adult inmate population in state prisons, work release centers, and local facilities is expected to grow 9,000 by the year 2003. The DOC has projected that the total Louisiana adult inmate population will reach 42,706 by June 2003. This will be a 27 percent increase from approximately 33,700 inmates in 1999.

From 1990 to 1998, the nation's federal and state adult prison population increased at an average annual rate of 6.7 percent. The prison population increased nearly 528,100 in

eight years. Over this time period, Louisiana's adult prison population rose at an average annual rate of 7.1 percent and increased by 13,628.

The DOC reported a secure juvenile population of 2,039 as of June 1999. DOC projects that the secure juvenile population in Louisiana will decline to 1,970 through year 2002 before it rises slightly to 2,095 by June 2004.

**Four Year
Population
Growth Projected
to Cost \$122
Million**

The DOC estimates that Louisiana's adult correctional facilities, work release centers, and local facilities will add almost 10,000 beds through 2002-03. This would bring the total available bed space to more than 43,000. Yet this increase in bed space will do little more than keep pace with the inmate population increase projected by DOC. The total capital and operating costs associated with growth in bed space may reach more than \$175 million in this four-year period. Although some federal funding is anticipated, more than \$122 million of these costs would have to be funded by the State of Louisiana.

Matter for Legislative Consideration

- 2.1 The legislature, in consultation with DOC and other appropriate public and private agencies, may wish to consider means to fund projected continuing increases in Louisiana's adult and juvenile inmate populations.**

Recommendations

- 2.1 DOC should consider the most cost-effective and cost-efficient means of managing Louisiana's prison population. The department should examine all cost elements of the corrections system: administration, incarceration, rehabilitation, and health. Particular attention should be given to possibilities for controlling long-term costs, even if, in areas such as rehabilitation, these possibilities could require some short-term increases in funding.**
- 2.2 In addition, DOC should continue considering cost-effective and cost-efficient alternatives to traditional incarceration. These alternatives to traditional incarceration could include some or all of the following:**

- **Community Confinement: Residence in a community treatment center, halfway house, restitution center, or other community facility**
- **Home Detention: Confinement and supervision that restricts the individual to his or her place of residence continuously, except for authorized absences, enforced by appropriate means of surveillance (such as electronic monitoring)**
- **Intermittent Confinement: Custody for intervals of time, such as weekends**
- **Community Service**

**Housing State
Offenders
Annually Costs a
Minimum of \$400
Million**

In fiscal year 1998-99, the direct operating expenditures for housing state adult and juvenile offenders in secure facilities was almost \$400 million. DOC spent \$233 million and \$51.3 million to operate the state adult and juvenile facilities, respectively. The DOC spent an additional \$115 million to house state offenders in local jail facilities. These expenditures do not include certain administrative, capital and other costs associated with incarcerating offenders.

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$35.04 per day to house an offender in a state adult correctional facility. An average of \$39.20 per day was spent to house maximum-security inmates, compared to an average of \$29.90 for minimum-security inmates. (There are three security or custody levels: maximum, medium, and minimum.) The DOC's average expenditures to keep a juvenile offender in a Louisiana correctional facility were \$72.86 per day.

**Incarceration Is
77 Percent of
Prison Operating
Expense**

Incarceration is, by far, the most expensive component of prison costs. In fiscal year 1998-99, it accounts for almost 77 percent of total adult facilities' operational expenditures and for 61 percent of juvenile facilities' expenditures. In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$30.51 per day to provide only the incarceration portion of housing an adult offender in a maximum-security state adult correctional facility. Incarceration includes expenses for housing, clothing, feeding and securing offenders. Salary is the largest component of incarceration costs. The

physical plant layout and the custody categories of offenders affect the number of correctional officers needed to control a facility.

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$3.13 per day to provide only the administration portion of keeping an adult offender in a state prison. In fiscal year 1997-98, the DOC spent an average of \$4.29 per day. The main reason for this decrease is that a smaller amount of insurance premiums was paid in fiscal year 1998-99.

**DOC Spent \$4.39
Per Day for
Health Care of
Adult Inmates**

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$4.39 per day to provide only the health care portion of keeping an inmate in a state adult correctional facility. Health care includes expenditures for physical and mental health as well as substance abuse programs. DOC funded health care expenses represent only a portion of total state spending for the health of Louisiana's state inmates. The Louisiana State University Medical Center System (the charity hospitals) estimates that it provided \$25 million of health care services in fiscal year 1998-99 for the treatment of all state inmates and juvenile offenders. (The Medical Center System does not keep cost information on services provided to offenders.) Using an estimate of \$12 million of costs for adult offenders, charity hospital care would increase the average health care expenditure by \$1.03 from \$4.39 to \$5.42 per day for each inmate in a state prison.

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$0.50 per day to provide only the rehabilitation portion of keeping an adult offender in a state prison. DOC's rehabilitation includes expenditures for literacy and job skill courses, recreation, libraries, and religious activities. The Louisiana Community and Technical College System spent more than \$3.4 million to conduct vocational-technical and academic courses at adult prisons. This System's expenditures average \$0.51 per day per inmate and thus increase the average rehabilitation expenditure to \$1.01 per day for each inmate in a Louisiana adult correctional facility.

**DOC's Cost Data
Do Not Include
All Costs of
Incarceration**

DOC's cost data do not include all expenses associated with incarceration of offenders. DOC incurs administrative costs at its headquarters to oversee and provide support to the various correctional facilities. None of these costs are allocated to individual institutions. Also, if DOC sends an inspection team or other assistance to an adult facility, the costs associated with such activity are not charged to the facility receiving the services.

However, if DOC provides a security presence at a private juvenile facility in an emergency situation, then it is reimbursed, according to a DOC official. Other costs not included in DOC's cost data are capital costs such as depreciation of a facility and any interest incurred on debt to finance the facility's construction. In addition, there are costs associated with services provided by other governmental entities, such as the LSU Medical Center System.

Without complete cost information, it is difficult to know what it really costs the state to incarcerate an offender. A decision maker can review DOC's cost information for Level I (maximum security) facilities and think that health costs were \$5.58 per inmate per day in fiscal year 1998-99. However, the true cost of providing Level I health care is higher because an estimated \$25 million worth of health care services were provided to state offenders by the LSU Medical Center System. The omission of relevant costs also makes it difficult to compare accurately one facility with another facility.

If the DOC could develop a cost model that portrayed costs of incarceration more completely, the legislature, DOC and other parties would have more accurate information for decision-making purposes. This model should include capital costs, costs of services furnished by other governmental entities, and an allocation to each facility of the appropriate amount of DOC's headquarters' administrative expenses.

Recommendations

- 3.1 To furnish decision makers with more accurate information, DOC should develop a cost model that considers all costs of operating a correctional facility. This model should portray different components of costs to assist decision makers in comparing one facility with another.**
- 3.2 All state agencies furnishing services to offenders should cooperate with the DOC by capturing data on costs of incarceration and providing this information quarterly to DOC.**

- 3.3 The DOC should collect and analyze all components of cost in order to make decisions on the most cost-effective means of providing incarceration of state offenders.**

Matter for Legislative Consideration

- 3.1 The legislature may wish to mandate that other state agencies capture cost data on services provided to offenders and furnish this information quarterly to DOC.**

Housing a Juvenile Costs \$72.86 Per Day

The DOC spent more than \$51.3 million in fiscal year 1998-99 in direct operational costs to keep juvenile offenders in Louisiana facilities. This averages \$72.86 per day for each juvenile offender. In fiscal year 1997-98, DOC spent an average of \$72.11 per day for each offender. DOC spends a much larger proportion of total juvenile facilities' expenditures on juvenile rehabilitation programs (11 percent) than the percentage of total adult facilities' expenditures spent on adult rehabilitation (1.4 percent). This is because juvenile offenders must be provided a comprehensive education. In addition to DOC's rehabilitation expenditures, Special School District #1 and two other school districts spent approximately \$4.5 million in fiscal year 1998-99 to provide educational services at juvenile facilities.

Bridge City Correctional Center for Youth (Bridge City) is the most expensive juvenile facility on an offender per day basis. The DOC spent an average of \$92.63 per offender each day at Bridge City in fiscal year 1998-99. The two privately managed facilities at Tallulah and Jena were cheaper on a daily expenditure per offender basis than the three state-managed facilities. DOC spent an average of \$71 at the Tallulah Correctional Center for Youth (Tallulah) and \$70 at the Jena Correctional Center for Youth (Jena) in fiscal year 1998-99.

DOC Contracted for Operation of Tallulah and Jena

DOC entered into cooperative endeavor agreements for the operation of Jena and Tallulah. The state does not own these facilities. These agreements originally obligated DOC for 25 years or until principal and interest on debt incurred to construct the facilities are paid off. However, the agreement with the City of Tallulah was amended several times. One amendment provided that DOC would pay debt principal and interest, property taxes,

and insurance in the event DOC took over operation of Tallulah. A later amendment consolidated these specific costs, in the event of a takeover, into a reduced per diem of \$16.62 for 686 offenders. This amounts to \$4.2 million annually. DOC assumed operation of Tallulah in September 1999. Under provisions of the contract, the per diem does not reduce once the facility's construction debt has been repaid. DOC is in negotiations with the contractor concerning contract provisions.

A Comparison of Three Medium Security Prisons

Three prisons are nearly identical in size, design, and the type and number of inmates they house. These are Allen Correctional Center (Allen), Avoyelles Correctional Center (Avoyelles) and Winn Correctional Center (Winn). Allen and Winn are privately managed institutions. DOC manages Avoyelles.

In fiscal year 1998-99, DOC spent an average of \$25.91 per inmate per day to operate Allen and Avoyelles. DOC spent an average of \$27.02 per day to operate Winn. However, including vocational-technical expenditures by the Louisiana Community and Technical College System, the average costs per day to operate Allen are \$26.08, \$26.44 for Avoyelles, and \$27.02 for Winn in fiscal year 1998-99. These expenditure figures are the direct costs of operating the facility and do not include capital costs such as building depreciation and interest. The expenditures for Avoyelles do not include any DOC headquarters' administrative costs. The expenditure figures for the two privately managed facilities (Winn and Allen) are based on contractual payments made by the DOC, plus some maintenance and repair costs incurred by the DOC.

Private Prisons Have Lower Medical Costs

Allen and Winn have lower medical operating costs than Avoyelles. Avoyelles has more medical staff and provides more inmate medical contacts. Avoyelles also fills more prescriptions than the two private facilities. According to DOC officials, the inmate population at Avoyelles may need more medical services because of the selection of inmates housed in the facility.

Although the three institutions offer very similar social rehabilitation programs, Winn offers more vocational-technical courses and has a larger rehabilitation staff than the other two prisons. Avoyelles' per inmate spending on rehabilitation is lower than Allen or Winn's.

Private Prisons Have Lower Security Costs

The private prisons have much lower security costs than Avoyelles. Allen and Winn have smaller numbers of correctional officers and, consequently, larger inmate to correctional officer ratios than Avoyelles. Winn and Allen also have a higher turnover of correctional officers than does Avoyelles.

Winn reported the highest expenditures for administration in fiscal year 1998-99. Allen reported the lowest. Winn allocates a percentage of its corporate overhead to administrative operating costs. It also accounts for depreciation, commissary purchases, and all employees' benefits in the Administration category. These factors help explain Winn's higher administration costs. In the cost data furnished us, Allen and Avoyelles did not include depreciation, and only included a portion of employee benefits, in the Administration category.

The state built and owns Avoyelles, Winn, and Allen. The state is responsible for heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) replacement. The two private companies are responsible, in general, for all other facility maintenance. In fiscal year 1998-99, DOC spent approximately \$39,000 and \$59,000 at Winn and Allen, respectively, for HVAC-related costs.

Contractual Arrangements With Allen and Winn

Allen and Winn are managed under contract by Wackenhut Corrections Corporation and the Corrections Corporation of America, respectively. These private companies are generally responsible for maintaining the facilities in terms of day-to-day operations and are paid a per diem. The contractual agreements between the state and these two companies provide for responsibilities regarding ACA standards, medical care, education, rehabilitation, and security. Also, the contracts stipulate that the State of Louisiana is to be held harmless from claims and liability resulting from acts or omissions to act of the contractors.

Recommendation

- 4.1 The DOC should collect all costs associated with privately and publicly run facilities. In addition, the DOC should consider billing for its services in connection with privately run facilities. Contractual arrangements should include provisions for billing for DOC services to private contractors.**

Building New Prison Could Provide Savings

Building a new prison might yield cost savings to the state over the long term, if one of the more expensive prisons were replaced. DOC's average cost per day for each inmate at Avoyelles was \$25.91 in fiscal year 1998-99. This is somewhat cheaper than the average costs at other Level II (medium security) facilities. For instance, DOC's average cost was \$35.22 per day at Washington Correctional Institute, for a daily difference of \$9.31 compared to Avoyelles. To ascertain if building another prison with a design (and associated costs) like Avoyelles would be beneficial, we made some assumptions and computed potential savings.

The Legislative Fiscal Office's Report to the Southern Legislative Conference contains projections of construction costs for new prisons. A new 1,500-bed prison in Louisiana was projected to cost \$43,063,514 as of July 1999. We assumed that Louisiana could issue a 25-year general obligation bond at 6 percent interest to finance construction of a new facility and that this bond would be repaid in the 25th year. Interest costs for such a financing would total \$2,584,000 annually ($\$43,063,514 \times .06$). The \$9.31 daily savings for 1,500 inmates would yield almost \$5.1 million in annual inmate incarceration cost savings ($1,500 \times \$9.31 \times 365$ days). This would result in annual savings of \$2.5 million ($\5.1 million - \$2.6 million of interest cost). However, the \$43 million bond issue must be repaid in the 25th year (or ratably over 25 years).

The actual savings from these assumptions total almost \$19.8 million over 25 years, if the bonds are not repaid until the 25th year. These savings could occur whether the state or a private company managed the facility.

Recommendation

- 4.2 The DOC should consider alternatives to high costs per day for incarceration. For example, it could consider building newer facilities that are more efficient and effective.**

Matter for Legislative Consideration

- 4.1 The legislature may wish to consider funding newer correctional facilities that are more cost efficient.**

Louisiana Houses 40 Percent of State Inmates in Local Facilities

Louisiana houses more than 14,000 or more than 40 percent of its adult state inmates in local facilities. This is due, in part, to the increasing state prison population. Expenditures for the Sheriffs' Housing of State Inmates program are estimated at \$137 million in fiscal year 1999-2000, according to the fiscal year 2000-01 Executive Budget. The state pays a per diem of \$23 to sheriffs and local governing authorities for each state inmate housed in their local facilities.

Louisiana ranks very high in the number and percentage of state inmates housed in local facilities. In 1997, Louisiana had nearly one-third of all state inmates housed in local jails across the United States. In 1999, Louisiana ranked higher than 15 other Southern states in the number of state inmates housed locally.

Use of Local Jails Is Cheaper

The DOC's ability to incarcerate state inmates in local facilities saves the state money. The \$23 per diem paid for housing state inmates at the local level is less expensive than the daily operating costs of the adult state facilities. However, the number and variety of rehabilitation programs offered to state inmates in the local facilities are generally less extensive than those offered in the state facilities. As a result, DOC inmates housed in local jails may not be receiving the services necessary for their rehabilitation and successful return to society.

DOC's Oversight of State Inmates in Local Facilities

The DOC exercises limited control over state inmates in local jails. The DOC monitors local jails through the Basic Jail Guidelines audit process and keeps track of which jails state inmates are housed in. However, the local jails have day-to-day custody and management of state inmates. Therefore, the DOC may not be aware if state inmates receive adequate medical, mental health, rehabilitation, and security services in the most effective manner.

Recommendations

- 5.1 The DOC should consider establishing a contract process with those local correctional facilities housing state inmates. The contract between the DOC and such local facilities should stipulate what services are to be provided by the jails and who will pay for them.**

- 5.2 The DOC should have, in the contract, a provision that holds the state, DOC, its officers, agents, and employees harmless from claims and liability arising out of injury, death, property damage, et cetera, that are the result of an act or omission to act of the local law enforcement district or local correctional facility. This provision should stipulate that the law enforcement district or local correctional facility will repay the DOC if the DOC is held liable for an act or omission of the district or local correctional facility. The agreement should also provide that the local district and/or facility will pay for the attorney fees, if found at fault.**

Sheriffs Determine Where State Inmates Are Housed

For the most part, local sheriffs in Louisiana determine which state inmates will be sent to DOC facilities and which state inmates will be housed in their local jails. As a general rule, state inmates housed in local jails do not go through the Adult Reception and Diagnostic Center (ARDC) at Hunt Correctional Center or similar centers at LCIW and Wade. These centers screen inmates for proper classification and placement. As a result, correctional staff may not be able to determine what services are necessary to effectively incarcerate and rehabilitate state inmates housed in local jails.

Recommendations

- 5.3 The DOC should establish regulations mandating a screening process of state inmates in local jails reflective of processes at ARDC. Local jails should also report this classification information to ARDC. This would allow the DOC to pinpoint problem inmates and to make more adequate placement decisions.**
- 5.4 The DOC may want to study the feasibility of processing all state inmates at DOC's ARDC facilities.**

Inmate Location and Billing Verification

The DOC uses the CAJUN II (Corrections and Justice Unified Network) system, maintained by Hunt Correctional Center's Adult Reception and Diagnostic Center (ARDC), to verify accurate inmate location and billing associated with the housing of state inmates in local jails. If billing errors are not detected through limited sampling, DOC has another procedure to check

billings. However, this procedure may not ascertain if the DOC is appropriately paying for inmates who are housed in local jails.

We checked 176 inmate names, from two jail rosters, through the CAJUN II system and found 14 (8 percent) potential problems. More specifically, we identified eight CAJUN records that contradicted the physical location of the inmates listed on the jail rosters. Also, we found no records in CAJUN for six inmate names. ARDC staff explained that sheriffs and local jails are supposed to notify them when inmates are transferred. However, this does not always happen. As a result, there are discrepancies between invoices, or jail rosters, and CAJUN records. In addition, no records may exist for some DOC inmates because of delays in processing. Also, an official at Hunt stated that sheriffs may submit names to the DOC of inmates who are not yet the financial responsibility of the DOC (e.g., parole violators), but this is not supposed to occur.

Recommendation

- 5.5 The DOC should evaluate the CAJUN II system for accurate and complete records. To do this, the department may want to consider the reporting and recording processes that occur between ARDC and those local facilities housing state inmates. Also, DOC should evaluate the effectiveness of its 10 percent sampling verification method to identify billing errors.**

Incomplete Performance Data Presented in Executive Budget

The fiscal year 1999-2000 Executive Budget presents incomplete performance data for the Sheriffs' Housing of State Inmates program. Also, there is no uniform cost reporting by the local facilities associated with the housing of state inmates. As a result, it is very difficult for legislative, department, and local officials to determine how the appropriated \$137 million is being used. In addition, it may be difficult to determine if the money is being spent effectively and efficiently.

Recommendation

- 5.6 The DOC, LSA, and sheriffs of local jails may want to cooperate with OPB to establish complete performance data for the Sheriffs' Housing of State Inmates**

program. By including complete performance data (i.e., mission, goals, objectives, and a mix of performance indicators), the legislature may be able to more easily determine what is being achieved with the \$137 million spent on this program.

Cost Information Not Reported For State Inmates

Local facilities generally do not track and report expenses related to DOC inmates. It follows that they cannot break out administration, incarceration, rehabilitation, and health costs for state inmates like DOC can for state prisons. As a result, it is difficult for the legislature to determine exactly how much of the \$137 million it appropriates to the Sheriffs' Housing of State Inmates program is actually spent on DOC inmates. The total expenditures reported in the 1999-2000 Executive Budget for the DOC reached \$573 million. The expenditures reported for the Sheriffs' Housing of State Inmates program accounts for 24 percent of the total expenditures.

For several reasons, we sent out cost templates to 97 sheriffs and local facilities that house DOC inmates. First, we wanted to capture cost information and determine how much it actually costs to house a state inmate in a local facility. Also, we wanted to determine if local jails had cost information readily available. Finally, we wanted to see how much money local jails were spending on rehabilitation programs for state inmates. Of the 97 letters we mailed, only six sheriffs and 14 other local facilities responded to our cost template requests (see Appendix C for the list of those who received cost templates and those who responded). An official of the Louisiana Sheriffs' Association stated that local sheriffs would have difficulty responding to our cost templates because they do not track and report costs like state facilities (i.e., administration, incarceration, rehabilitation, health). Sheriffs generally have law enforcement, tax collection, and other functions besides operation of the jail. The local jail is typically not set up as a separate entity for accounting purposes. Also, for some jails, another local governmental body (e.g., police jury) contributes to jail costs, in addition to the sheriff.

After reviewing and analyzing the 20 cost templates we received, we concluded that the reported daily costs per inmate ranged from a low of \$13.68 at West Carroll Detention Center to a high of \$198 at Eunice. Most local facilities were in the range of \$20 to \$35. For example, daily costs reported for Riverbend Detention Center were \$21.74 per inmate in fiscal year 1997-98

and \$20.04 in fiscal year 1998-99. We could not calculate the costs for four of the 20 jails because of insufficient information. The reliability of these numbers is suspect because most cost information we received was not audited.

If sheriffs and local jails are unable to report cost information for DOC inmates in a detailed manner, it is very difficult for policy makers and department officials to determine what the state and DOC are receiving for the per diem payments. If the local jails cannot break out costs and report them to DOC, it is difficult for legislative, department, and local officials to determine if the current per diem is an overestimated or underestimated figure. If the DOC is responsible for these inmates, it needs to establish and maintain more effective oversight. To do this, the DOC needs management tools including accurate cost data and performance data.

Recommendation

- 5.7 The legislature, DOC, and LSA may want to consider establishing uniform cost reporting for the local facilities housing state inmates. Costs could be reported by administration, incarceration, rehabilitation, and health. This type of reporting would be more reflective of costs reported by the state prisons and might give legislative, department, and local officials an idea of how much money is actually spent on the DOC inmates and for what types of programs.**

Matter for Legislative Consideration

- 5.1 The legislature may wish to consider, and communicate to DOC, what cost components should be reported by the local jails regarding the housing of state inmates. Cost reporting requirements could then be developed and monitored by DOC. Ultimately, DOC and the local facilities could report the requested cost information to the legislature.**

**More
Rehabilitation
Might Reduce
Projected Growth
in Adult Inmates**

The number of Louisiana's adult inmates in state facilities grew by 57.5 percent (7,050 inmates) between 1989 and 1999. By 2004, the adult inmate population in state facilities is projected to grow an additional 18.4 percent.

One way that Louisiana can seek to meet this projected influx of new state inmates is by seeking to reduce our state's recidivism rate. One means of reducing recidivism could involve increased reliance on inmate rehabilitation programs.

**\$6 Million Spent
on Rehabilitation
in Fiscal Year
1998-99**

In fiscal year 1998-99, Louisiana spent at least \$6 million for adult prison rehabilitation programs. Yet currently it is nearly impossible to determine if the state's recidivism rate is impacted by the millions of dollars spent each year on rehabilitation programs. Because of the amount of funds being spent, it may be of interest to the legislature and to the DOC to consider whether rehabilitation programs have a beneficial impact on the recidivism rates of former inmates and, therefore, on the safety of the Louisiana public.

The DOC and local correctional facilities have not regularly compiled program-specific recidivism information that could serve to support the cost-effectiveness of these programs. Several months ago, the DOC began an organized effort to collect recidivism information on inmates who participate in certain types of rehabilitation. Beginning in the next fiscal year, legislative and department officials should begin to receive information about the effect of rehabilitation on recidivism.

Recommendation

- 6.1 The DOC, in cooperation with the OPB and legislative staff, should regularly gather and report performance information related to the success of rehabilitation programs in curbing recidivism. This information should include DOC inmates being housed in local jails.**

The gathering and reporting of this information on the relationship between rehabilitation and recidivism may assist the legislature in its budget deliberations. It can help to determine whether the funds currently provided for rehabilitation have a cost-effective impact on reducing the recidivism rate of Louisiana inmates.

No Consensus About Impact of Rehabilitation Programs on Recidivism

There is no consensus among researchers as to whether rehabilitation programs reduce recidivism. Researchers found that drug treatment programs may reduce recidivism. In addition, sex offender programs may have an impact on recidivism. However, studies present differing conclusions on the impact of these programs. The impacts of education programs and prison industry programs remain unclear among researchers.

Minnesota is a state that places great emphasis on rehabilitation as a means of curbing recidivism. In 1995, Minnesota's DOC spent more than \$17 million on rehabilitation programs for adult institutions. Yet Minnesota's recidivism rates do not vary appreciably from those of other states. Although Louisiana has a comparatively low level of rehabilitation program funding (more than \$6 million in fiscal year 1998-99), our recidivism rate for adult offenders is essentially identical to that found in Minnesota. Louisiana's recidivism rate for inmates in adult facilities within three years after release is 40.3 percent, compared with 40 percent in Minnesota.

Two Louisiana Studies Suggest the Value of Rehabilitation Programs

Studies of the Blue Walters substance abuse program at Dixon Correctional Institute and of vocational and GED programs at the Louisiana Correctional Institute for Women (LCIW) support the value of rehabilitation programs in reducing recidivism. Specifically, the Blue Walters study suggests that rehabilitation, when coupled with post-release follow-up, may be effective in reducing recidivism and promoting employment. The LCIW study concluded that education programs reduce recidivism.

Matter for Legislative Consideration

- 6.1 The legislature may wish to mandate further study of the relationship between rehabilitation programs and reductions in inmate recidivism in Louisiana. Based on careful consideration of information obtained from all available studies, the legislature may wish to consider the desirability of requiring rehabilitation programs for the state inmates currently housed in local jails.**

Chapter 1: Introduction

Initiation and Objectives

In the 1999 Regular Session, the Louisiana Legislature enacted House Concurrent Resolution Number 43. This resolution requested the Legislative Auditor to conduct a study and comparison of state-operated and privately operated correctional facilities in Louisiana to determine the overall effectiveness and efficiency of each. In addition, the resolution requested the Legislative Auditor to look at operating costs, types and quality of services, recidivism rates, and security concerns. On August 26, 1999, the Legislative Audit Advisory Council approved this audit.

The legislature appropriated \$328.4 million to the Department of Public Safety and Corrections, Corrections Services (DOC) to house adult inmates and juvenile offenders in state facilities for fiscal year 1999-2000. The legislature appropriated another \$137.4 million for the Sheriffs' Housing of State Inmates program in fiscal year 1999-2000 to house adult and juvenile offenders in state custody in parish and local jails.

Over the past 10 years the number of adult inmate and juvenile offenders in state custody has increased substantially. Currently, there are more than 33,000 adult inmates and more than 2,000 juvenile offenders housed in state, private, or local correctional facilities. The increasing demand for bed space for both the adult and the juvenile offender population has significant cost and safety implications for the state. Therefore, the primary objectives of this audit were as follows:

- Analyze the operating costs for DOC's adult and juvenile correctional facilities for fiscal years 1997-98 and 1998-99
- Compare the operational costs and services rendered at three nearly identical prisons: the state-operated Avoyelles Correctional Center (Avoyelles) and the privately-operated Allen Correctional Center (Allen) and Winn Correctional Center (Winn)
- Determine recidivism rates in Louisiana and assess the effect of rehabilitation programs on recidivism

- Determine projected adult inmate and juvenile offender population growth and associated growth in state expenditures
- Analyze the operating costs for local jails in Louisiana that housed adult inmates in state custody for fiscal years 1997-98 and 1998-99
- Examine the process of housing state inmates in local jails, and compare Louisiana's practices with other states and also, compare services provided to state inmates in local jails with services offered in DOC facilities

Report Conclusions

Louisiana's adult inmate population is expected to grow 9,000 by the year 2003. The DOC has projected that the total Louisiana adult inmate population will reach 42,706 by June 2003. This will be a 27 percent increase from approximately 33,700 inmates in 1999.

From 1990 to 1998, the nation's federal and state adult prison population increased at an average annual rate of 6.7 percent. The prison population increased nearly 528,100 in eight years. Over the same time period, Louisiana's adult prison population rose at an average annual rate of 7.1 percent and increased by 13,628. In the last 10 years, the inmate population in the Southern Legislative Conference states has more than doubled from 235,000 to almost 505,000 inmates housed in state facilities. From 1989 to 1999, Louisiana reported a 57 percent increase in its inmate population housed in state adult correctional facilities.

The DOC reported a secure juvenile population of 2,039 as of June 1999. It has projected that the secure juvenile population in Louisiana will decline to 1,970 through year 2002 before it rises to 2,095 by June 2004.

The DOC estimates that Louisiana's adult correctional facilities, work release centers, and local facilities will add almost 10,000 beds through 2002-03. This would bring the total available bed space to more than 43,000. Yet this increase in bed space will do little more than keep pace with the inmate population increase projected by DOC. The total capital and operating costs associated with growth in bed space may reach more than \$175 million in this four-year period. More than

\$122 million of these costs would have to be funded by the State of Louisiana.

In seeking solutions, DOC should consider the most cost-effective and cost-efficient means of managing Louisiana's state prison population, focusing on all elements of corrections costs. DOC should also continue studying cost-effective alternatives to traditional forms of incarceration.

In fiscal year 1998-99, DOC's direct operating expenditures for housing state adult and juvenile offenders were almost \$400 million. DOC spent \$233 million and \$51.3 million to operate the state adult and juvenile facilities, respectively. The department spent an additional \$115 million to house state offenders in local jail facilities. (Housing of state offenders in local jails is discussed in Chapter 5). These expenditures do not include certain administrative, capital and other costs associated with incarcerating offenders.

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$35.04 per day to house an offender in a state adult correctional facility. An average of \$39.20 per day was spent to house maximum security inmates, compared to an average of \$29.90 for minimum security inmates. The DOC's average expenditures to keep a juvenile offender in a Louisiana facility were \$72.86 per day.

Incarceration is, by far, the most expensive component of prison costs. In fiscal year 1998-99, it accounts for almost 77 percent of total adult facilities' expenditures and for 61 percent of juvenile facilities' expenditures. In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$30.51 per day to provide only the incarceration portion of housing an adult offender in a maximum-security state adult correctional facility. Salary is the largest component of incarceration costs. The physical plant layout and the custody categories of adult inmates affect the number of correctional officers needed to control a facility.

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$4.39 per day to provide only the health care portion of keeping an inmate in a state adult correctional facility. DOC funded health care expenses represent only a portion of total state spending for the health of Louisiana's state offenders. The Louisiana State University Medical Center System (the

charity hospitals) provided \$25 million of health services in fiscal year 1998-99 for the treatment of state inmates and juvenile offenders. (The Medical Center System does not keep cost information on services provided to inmates.) Using an estimate of \$12 million of actual costs for adult offenders, charity hospital care would increase the average expenditure by \$1.03 from \$4.39 to \$5.42 per day for each inmate in a state prison.

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$3.13 per day to provide only the administration portion of keeping an adult offender in a state prison. In fiscal year 1997-98, the DOC spent an average of \$4.29 per day. The main reason for this decrease in expenditures is that a smaller amount of insurance premiums was paid in fiscal year 1998-99.

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$0.50 per day to provide only the rehabilitation portion of keeping an adult offender in a state prison. The Louisiana Community and Technical College System spent more than \$3.4 million to conduct courses at adult prisons. This System's expenditures average \$0.51 per day per inmate and thus increase the average expenditure to \$1.01 per day for each inmate in a Louisiana adult correctional facility.

The DOC spent more than \$51.3 million in fiscal year 1998-99 to keep juvenile offenders in Louisiana facilities. This averages \$72.86 per day for each juvenile offender. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average spent for each offender was \$72.11. DOC spends a much larger proportion of total juvenile facilities' expenditures on juvenile rehabilitation programs (11 percent) than the percentage of total adult facilities' expenditures spent on adult rehabilitation (1.4 percent). This is because juvenile offenders must be provided a comprehensive education.

DOC entered into cooperative endeavor agreements for the operation of Jena and Tallulah. These agreements originally obligated DOC for 25 years or until principal and interest on debt incurred to construct the facilities are paid off. However, the agreement with the City of Tallulah was amended several times. One amendment provided that DOC would pay debt principal and interest, property taxes, and insurance in the event DOC took over operation of Tallulah. A later amendment consolidated these specific costs, in the event

of a takeover, into a reduced per diem of \$16.62 for 686 offenders. This amounts to \$4.2 million annually. DOC assumed operation of Tallulah in September 1999. Under provisions of the contract, the per diem does not reduce once the facility's construction debt has been repaid. DOC is in negotiations with the contractor concerning contract provisions.

In fiscal year 1998-99, DOC spent an average of \$25.91 per inmate per day to operate Allen Correctional Center (Allen) and Avoyelles Correctional Center (Avoyelles). DOC spent an average of \$27.02 per day to operate Winn Correctional Center (Winn). However, in fiscal year 1998-99, the Louisiana Community and Technical College System spent approximately \$95,000 and \$300,000 at Allen and Avoyelles, respectively, to provide vocational-technical courses. When these expenditures are added to DOC's operational expenses, an average of \$26.08 per inmate per day was spent for Allen, \$26.44 for Avoyelles, and \$27.02 for Winn.

These expenditure figures do not include capital costs such as building depreciation and interest. The expenditure numbers for Avoyelles do not include any DOC headquarters' administrative costs. The expenditure figures for the two privately managed facilities (Winn and Allen) are based on contractual payments made by the DOC, plus some maintenance and repair costs incurred by the DOC for these two prisons.

Allen and Winn have lower medical operating costs than Avoyelles. Avoyelles has more medical staff and provides more inmate medical contacts. Avoyelles also fills more prescriptions than the two private facilities. The inmate population at Avoyelles may need more medical services because of the selection of inmates housed in the facility, according to a DOC official.

Although the three institutions offer very similar social rehabilitation programs, Winn offers more vocational-technical courses and has a larger rehabilitation staff than the other two prisons. Avoyelles reports a lower per inmate spending on rehabilitation than does Allen or Winn.

The private prisons have much lower security costs than Avoyelles. Allen and Winn have smaller numbers of security

officers and, consequently, larger inmate to security officer ratios than Avoyelles. Winn and Allen also have a higher turnover of security officers than does Avoyelles.

Avoyelles, Winn, and Allen are nearly identical in size, design, and the type and number of inmates. The state built and owns all three facilities. The state is responsible for heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) replacement. The two private companies are responsible, in general, for all other facility maintenance. In fiscal year 1998-99, DOC spent approximately \$39,000 and \$59,000 at Winn and Allen, respectively, for HVAC-related costs.

Allen and Winn are managed under contract by Wakenhut Corrections Corporation and the Corrections Corporation of America, respectively. These private companies are generally responsible for maintaining the facilities in terms of day-to-day operations and are paid a per diem. The contractual agreements between the state and these two companies provide for responsibilities regarding ACA standards, medical care, education, rehabilitation, and security. Also, the contracts stipulate that the State of Louisiana is to be held harmless from claims and liability resulting from acts or omissions to act of the contractors.

Louisiana houses 14,000 or more than 40 percent of its adult state inmates in local facilities. This is due, in part, to the increasing state prison population. Expenditures for the Sheriffs' Housing of State Inmates program has reached \$137 million according to the fiscal year 2000-01 Executive Budget. The state pays a per diem of \$23 to sheriffs and local governing authorities for each state inmate housed in their local facilities.

Louisiana ranks very high in the number and percentage of state inmates housed in local facilities. In 1997, Louisiana had nearly one-third of all state inmates housed in local jails across the United States. In 1999, Louisiana ranked higher than 15 other southern states in the number of state inmates housed locally. An official from the National Institute of Corrections told us that Louisiana's practice of housing state inmates in local jails for their entire sentence represents very much the exception. However, according to DOC Secretary Richard Stalder, President of the American Corrections Association, other states are outsourcing DOC inmates not only to local jails but also to other states.

The DOC's ability to incarcerate state inmates in local facilities is saving the state money. The \$23 per diem paid for housing state inmates at the local level is less expensive than the daily costs of the adult state facilities. However, the services provided in most local jails with such a per diem are not as extensive as those offered in state facilities.

For the most part, local sheriffs in Louisiana determine which state inmates will be sent to DOC facilities and which state inmates will be housed in their local jails. As a general rule, state inmates housed in local jails do not go through the adult reception and diagnostic centers at Hunt Correctional Center, Louisiana Correctional Institute for Women, and Wade Correctional Center. These centers screen inmates for proper classification and placement. As a result, correctional staff may not be able to determine what services are necessary to effectively incarcerate and rehabilitate state inmates housed in local jails.

In addition, the number and variety of rehabilitation programs offered to state inmates in the local facilities are generally less extensive than those offered in the state facilities. As a result, DOC inmates housed in local jails may not be receiving services necessary for their rehabilitation and successful return to society.

The DOC exercises limited control over state inmates in local jails. The DOC monitors local jails through the Basic Jail Guidelines audit process and keeps track of which jails state inmates are housed in. However, the local jails have day-to-day custody and management of state inmates. Therefore, the DOC may not be aware if adequate medical, mental health, rehabilitation, and security services are being delivered for state inmates in the most effective manner.

The DOC uses the CAJUN II (Corrections and Justice Unified Network) system, maintained by Hunt's ARDC, to verify accurate inmate location and billing associated with the housing of state inmates in local jails. If billing errors are not detected through limited sampling, DOC has another procedure to check billings. However, this procedure may not ensure that the DOC is appropriately paying for inmates who are housed in local jails.

The fiscal year 1999-2000 Executive Budget presents incomplete performance data for the Sheriffs' Housing of State Inmates program. Also, there is no uniform cost reporting by the local facilities associated with the housing of state inmates. As a result, it is very difficult for legislative, department, and local officials to determine how the appropriated \$137 million is being used. In addition, it may be difficult to determine if the money is being spent effectively and efficiently.

The number of Louisiana's adult inmates in state facilities grew by 57.5 percent (7,050 inmates) between 1989 and 1999. By 2004, the adult inmate population in state facilities is projected to grow an additional 18.4 percent. One way that Louisiana can seek to meet this projected influx of new state inmates is by seeking to reduce our state's recidivism rate. One means of reducing recidivism could involve increased reliance on inmate rehabilitation programs.

In fiscal year 1998-99, Louisiana spent at least \$6 million for adult prison rehabilitation programs. Yet currently it is nearly impossible to determine if the state's recidivism rate is impacted by the millions of dollars spent each year on rehabilitation programs. Because of the amount of funds being spent, it may be of interest to the legislature and to the DOC to consider whether rehabilitation programs have a beneficial impact on the recidivism rates of former inmates and, therefore, on the safety of the Louisiana public.

The DOC and local correctional facilities have not regularly compiled program-specific recidivism information that could serve to support the cost-effectiveness of these programs. Several months ago, the DOC began an organized effort to collect recidivism information on inmates who participate in certain types of rehabilitation. Beginning in the next fiscal year, legislative and department officials should begin to receive information about the effect of rehabilitation on recidivism.

However, there is no consensus among researchers as to whether rehabilitation programs reduce recidivism. Researchers found that drug treatment programs may reduce recidivism. In addition, sex offender programs may have an impact on recidivism. However, studies present differing conclusions on the impact of these programs. The impacts of

education programs and prison industry programs remain unclear among researchers.

Minnesota is a state that places great emphasis on rehabilitation as a means of curbing recidivism. In 1995, Minnesota's DOC spent more than \$17 million on rehabilitation programs for adult institutions compared to Louisiana's \$6 million spent in fiscal year 1998-99. Yet Minnesota's recidivism rates do not vary appreciably from those of other states. In particular, Louisiana's recidivism rate for inmates in adult facilities within three years after release is 40.3 percent, compared with 40 percent in Minnesota.

In 1993, the U.S. Justice Department conducted a study of Hunt Correctional Center's boot camp program (the IMPACT program). This study found no statistically significant differences in arrest rates during the first six months of community supervision between those who completed the IMPACT program and those who either dropped out of the program or did not participate. A 1996 U.S. Justice Department study found that graduates of Louisiana's boot camp program did have a lower recidivism rate than other inmates. However, this study attributed the lower recidivism rate to the intensive supervision received by the former boot camp inmates following their release, not to their boot camp experience.

Studies of the Blue Walters substance abuse program at Dixon Correctional Institute and of vocational and GED programs at the Louisiana Correctional Institute for Women (LCIW) support the value of rehabilitation programs in reducing recidivism. Specifically, the Blue Walters study suggests that rehabilitation, when coupled with post-release follow-up, may be effective in reducing recidivism and promoting employment. The LCIW study concluded that education programs reduce recidivism.

Scope and Methodology

This performance audit was conducted under the provisions of Title 24 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950, as amended. All performance audits are conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards as promulgated by the Comptroller General of the United States. Work on this audit began in July 1999 and ended in January 2000.

Scope

This audit focused on adult and juvenile facilities of the DOC and on some local jails that house state inmates. Specifically, this audit focused on operating costs, and types and levels of services at these facilities. Furthermore, we examined the comparative differences among three nearly identical prisons, two of which are privately operated. Finally, the audit gathered information on the state's process of housing inmates in state custody in local jails.

Because of time constraints, we relied on unaudited cost and other data provided by DOC and by individual correctional facilities. Some of these data were generated electronically. We also relied on DOC's management and EDP controls and did not assess the effectiveness of these controls.

Methodology

To obtain a general understanding of the laws, regulations, and procedures governing DOC's housing of adult and juvenile offenders in state, private, and local correctional facilities, we performed the following procedures:

- Reviewed the Louisiana Revised Statutes, Attorney General opinions, DOC rules and regulations, American Correctional Association standards, Basic Jail Guidelines, and news accounts concerning the level of security, medical care and rehabilitation offered to state inmates
- Reviewed DOC's operational audit reports and other DOC internal reports for each correctional facility in order to become familiar with internal controls and information DOC uses to oversee its adult and juvenile facilities
- Conducted research to identify national and state studies addressing costs associated with prison operations

We analyzed the operating costs and the services provided by adult and juvenile facilities. To achieve this, we performed the following procedures:

- Reviewed and analyzed cost and other information for fiscal years 1997-98 and 1998-99 furnished us by DOC to determine operating costs of its adult and juvenile correctional facilities
- Reviewed the 1999-2000 Executive Budget and the 2000-2001 Executive Budget and related documents
- Reviewed contracts between DOC and Wackenhut Corrections Corporation, which manages Allen and the Jena Correctional Center for Youth; between DOC and Corrections Corporation of America, which manages Winn; between the City of Tallulah and DOC; and DOC's contracts with two local law enforcement districts
- Interviewed officials of the National Institute of Corrections, CEGA Services, Inc., and the DOC to determine if there is a uniform method of organizing prison operational costs
- Interviewed DOC and Office of Planning and Budget (OPB) officials to obtain cost and budget information, as well as background information on various issues related to operations of correctional facilities in Louisiana
- Interviewed officials with the Louisiana Community and Technical College System and the LSU Health Care Services Division of the LSU Medical Center System to estimate how much non-DOC money is spent providing rehabilitation and medical services to offenders
- Reviewed Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletins, DOC's 1999 Briefing Book, and a 1999 Louisiana Legislative Fiscal Office Report to obtain a projection of inmate growth
- Visited 10 publicly and privately operated adult and juvenile facilities to obtain information related to services rendered and interviewed officials at the facilities and adult inmates

We analyzed DOC's cost information for the 11 adult and 5 juvenile facilities for the last two fiscal years. We did not audit the cost data furnished us by DOC and the correctional facilities. To control for the factor of differing offender population sizes, we

divided the cost category expenditures at each facility by the number of offenders housed in that facility, and calculated an average cost per offender per day. We present a clearer picture of Louisiana's total rehabilitation and health care costs to house offenders in state facilities. To accomplish this, in Chapters 3, 4, and 6, we added expenditures by the Louisiana Community and Technical College System to DOC's rehabilitation costs. In Chapter 3, we estimated amounts spent by the LSU Medical System and included these amounts with DOC's health care costs.

In order to have more detailed cost information for Winn, Allen, Tallulah, and Jena (the four privately managed facilities), we derived expenses for these facilities in certain exhibits contained in Chapter 3 and Chapter 6. DOC pays these four facilities on a per diem contract basis and, therefore, has no breakdown of costs among the four cost categories we use in this report (administrative, incarceration, health, and rehabilitation). However, these four privately managed facilities furnished us cost information organized by the four cost categories. We used the cost data provided by the facilities as a basis for allocating DOC's contract payments into the four cost categories.

We also compared Avoyelles financially with another prison, to determine if it might be cheaper to replace an older, expensive prison with a prison designed like Avoyelles, that is cheaper to operate. We assumed construction costs of \$43 million for a 1,500 bed facility and that this cost would be financed with a 25-year bond at 6 percent interest.

We then analyzed the operating costs, staffing, and services provided by Winn, Allen, and Avoyelles to identify differences and similarities among these three nearly identical facilities. We performed the following procedures:

- To obtain an understanding of previous comparisons of private versus publicly managed prisons, we reviewed an LSU study, a General Accounting Office study, a Tennessee privatization study, and other similar studies.
- We analyzed the medical, rehabilitation, and security services provided at Avoyelles, Allen, and Winn to identify similarities and differences.

We studied the impact rehabilitation has on reducing recidivism rates. To do this, we did the following:

- Reviewed Bureau of Justice Statistics studies, DOC's 1999 Briefing Book, and a 1997 study conducted by the Minnesota Legislative Auditor's Office to determine the impact of rehabilitation programs on recidivism, incidence of recidivism, and contributing factors
- Interviewed DOC officials concerning recidivism
- Reviewed studies done at two Louisiana facilities concerning the effect of rehabilitation on recidivism

We examined Louisiana's practice of housing state inmates in local jails. We performed the following procedures:

- Reviewed the Basic Jail Guidelines (BJG) and DOC's internal reports to become familiar with controls DOC uses to oversee local jails housing state inmates
- Interviewed officials of DOC and the Louisiana Sheriffs' Association to obtain an understanding of the process of placing state inmates in local jails and the services provided
- Sent cost templates to 97 sheriffs and jails housing state inmates to get an idea of the cost of housing inmates and to ascertain if jail operating costs were readily available
- Reviewed cost templates for fiscal years 1997-98 and 1998-99 provided by 20 sheriffs and local jails to attempt to determine the cost to house state inmates in local jails
- Checked the accuracy of inmate location information in DOC's CAJUN II system by taking a random sample from two large local jails' rosters and looking up the sampled inmates in the CAJUN II system
- Visited five local facilities and interviewed officials to obtain information related to services provided
- Interviewed National Institute of Corrections' staff and audit and corrections staff from Mississippi, Texas, and Pennsylvania to obtain feedback

regarding national trends for the local housing of state inmates

- Interviewed a former court-appointed expert to obtain feedback on Louisiana's housing of its inmates in local jails

Areas for Further Study

Areas for Further Study. As will be seen in Chapter 2, Louisiana's projected expansion of correctional facilities will do little more than keep these facilities at nearly full capacity. Therefore, in an effort to seek long-term solutions to offender population growth, and resulting cost increases, the following areas should be considered for further study:

- The impact of rehabilitation programs at Louisiana's correctional facilities on the recidivism rates of offenders completing these programs
- Alternatives to traditional incarceration, such as community confinement, home detention, intermittent confinement, and community service

Facility Name Abbreviations

In our report, we use the following abbreviations for the names of the state's 11 adult and 5 juvenile facilities:

- Louisiana State Penitentiary (Angola)
- Elayn Hunt Correctional Center (Hunt)
- Louisiana Correctional Institute for Women (LCIW)
- David Wade Correctional Center (Wade)
- Allen Correctional Center (Allen)
- Winn Correctional Center (Winn)
- Avoyelles Correctional Center (Avoyelles)
- Dixon Correctional Institute (Dixon)
- C. Paul Phelps Correctional Center (Phelps)
- Washington Correctional Institute (WCI)
- Work Training Facility-North (WTF-N)
- Swanson Correctional Center for Youth (Swanson)
- Jetson Correctional Center for Youth (Jetson)

- Bridge City Correctional Center for Youth (Bridge City)
- Tallulah Correctional Center for Youth (Tallulah)
- Jena Correctional Center for Youth (Jena)

Report Organization

The remainder of this report is organized as follows:

- **Chapter 2** gives a projection of adult inmate and juvenile offender population growth and associated costs.
- **Chapter 3** analyzes operational costs for adult and juvenile correctional facilities.
- **Chapter 4** gives the results of the comparisons of operational costs and services rendered at Avoyelles, Winn, and Allen.
- **Chapter 5** describes Louisiana's practice of housing state inmates in local jails. The chapter presents state and national statistics and explains the processes and consequences related to the housing of state inmates in local facilities. In addition, this chapter considers DOC oversight and the lack of performance data and cost reporting. Lastly, the chapter provides feedback from a national source and a former court-appointed expert.
- **Chapter 6** discusses the impact of rehabilitation programs on reducing recidivism rates.
- **Appendix A:** Analysis of Operating Costs of Adult and Juvenile Facilities
- **Appendix B:** Comparison of Costs, Services, and Staffing at Winn, Allen, and Avoyelles
- **Appendix C:** A list of sheriffs and local jails that were mailed cost templates and those that responded
- **Appendix D:** Response letter of the Department of Public Safety and Corrections, Corrections Services
- **Appendix E:** Response letter

Chapter 2: Projections for Adult and Juvenile Correctional Populations

Chapter Conclusions

Louisiana's adult state inmate population is expected to grow 9,000 by the year 2003. The DOC has projected that the total Louisiana adult inmate population will reach 42,706 by June 2003. This will be a 27 percent increase from approximately 33,700 inmates in 1999.

From 1990 to 1998, the nation's federal and state adult prison population increased at an average annual rate of 6.7 percent. The prison population increased nearly 528,100 in eight years. Over the same period, Louisiana's adult prison population rose at an average annual rate of 7.1 percent and increased by 13,628. In the last 10 years, the inmate population in the Southern Legislative Conference (SLC) states has more than doubled. From 1989 to 1999, Louisiana reported a 57 percent increase in its inmate population housed in state adult correctional facilities.

The DOC reported a secure juvenile population of 2,039 as of June 1999. It has projected that the secure juvenile population in Louisiana will decline to 1,970 through year 2002 before it rises to 2,095 by June 2004.

The DOC estimates that Louisiana's adult correctional facilities, work release centers, and local facilities will add almost 10,000 beds through 2002-03. This would bring the total available bed space to more than 43,000. Yet this increase in bed space will do little more than keep pace with the inmate population increase projected by DOC. The total capital and operating costs associated with growth in bed space may reach more than \$175 million in this four-year period. More than \$122 million of these costs would have to be funded by the State of Louisiana.

In seeking solutions, DOC should consider the most cost-effective and cost-efficient means of managing Louisiana's state prison population, focusing on all elements of corrections costs. DOC should also continue studying cost-effective alternatives to traditional forms of incarceration.

National and Louisiana Figures Show Increase in Adult Prison Population

Louisiana's adult state inmate population is expected to grow by 9,000 (27%) by the year 2003. DOC projects the adult population in state prisons, work release centers, and local facilities to total 42,706 inmates by June 2003. In October 1999, the DOC reported a total inmate population of 33,690.

From 1990 to 1998, the nation's federal and state adult prison population rose at an average annual rate of 6.7 percent and Louisiana's adult prison population grew by 7.1 percent. According to the U.S. Department of Justice's "Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin: Prisoners in 1998," the U.S. prison population increased by nearly 528,100 inmates in eight years. A total of 1,302,019 inmates were under the jurisdiction of state or federal correctional authorities by 1998. Overall, state prisons were operating between 13 and 22 percent over capacity at year-end 1998.

In comparison, Louisiana's adult inmate population under the jurisdiction of state or federal correctional authorities increased by 13,628 from 1990 to 1998. This was an average annual percentage increase of 7.1 percent.

Many factors contribute to the increasing number of persons incarcerated in the United States. There has been an increase in the number of state inmates sentenced for violent and drug offenses. The increase in the prison population can also be linked to the increasing numbers of parole violators being returned to prison. In addition, this growth is a result of declining release rates and increases in average time served. The national trend of increased inmate population is reflected in Southern prison statistics.

Adult Inmate Population in the Southern States Has More Than Doubled

In the last 10 years, the inmate population in the Southern Legislative Conference (SLC) states has more than doubled from 235,000 to almost 505,000 inmates housed in state facilities. According to information presented in a 1999 Legislative Fiscal Office report, the number of inmates housed in state facilities has more than doubled in the SLC in the last 10 years. Exhibit 2-1 on the following page shows the increase in each of these states.

**Louisiana's
Inmate
Population in
State Facilities
Increased by
57 Percent in
10 Years**

From 1989 to 1999 Louisiana reported a 57 percent increase in its inmate population housed in state correctional facilities. The growth in the number of DOC inmates housed in Louisiana's local jails is not included in Exhibit 2-1.

Exhibits 2-1 and 2-2 present the growth in SLC states' adult inmate populations between 1989 and 1999 and the projected growth in these populations by 2004.

Exhibit 2-1				
Growth of Adult Inmate Population in State Facilities				
Southern Legislative Conference States				
1989-1999				
State	Inmate Population: 1989	Inmate Population: 1999	Total Increase: 1989-1999	Percentage Increase: 1989-1999
Alabama	12,668	22,593	9,925	78.3
Arkansas	5,759	10,699	4,940	85.8
Florida	38,032	68,282	30,250	79.5
Georgia	19,515	41,665	22,150	113.5
Kentucky	6,633	11,849	5,216	78.6
Louisiana	12,253	19,303	7,050	57.5
Maryland	14,455	21,670	7,215	49.9
Mississippi	6,814	9,724	2,910	42.7
Missouri	11,922	25,385	13,463	112.9
North Carolina	17,531	31,593	14,062	80.2
Oklahoma	11,269	21,480	10,211	90.6
South Carolina	15,125	21,172	6,047	40.0
Tennessee	7,383	16,342	8,959	121.3
Texas	40,625	148,964	108,339	266.7
Virginia	13,505	31,178	17,673	130.9
West Virginia	1,488	3,004	1,516	101.9
Total	234,977	504,903	269,926	114.9
Source: Developed by Legislative Auditor's staff from information contained in the 1999 Adult Correctional Systems Report of the Louisiana Legislative Fiscal Office.				

Exhibit 2-2				
Projected Adult Inmate Population in State Facilities				
Southern Legislative Conference States				
1999-2004				
State	Inmate Population: 1999	Inmate Population: 2004	Total Increase: 1999-2004	Percentage Increase: 1999-2004
Alabama	22,593	29,848	7,255	32.1
Arkansas	10,699	13,669	2,970	27.8
Florida	68,282	90,128	21,846	32.0
Georgia	41,665	56,517	14,852	35.6
Kentucky	11,849	N/A	N/A	N/A
Louisiana	19,303	22,859	3,556	18.4
Maryland	21,670	24,450	2,780	12.8
Mississippi	9,724	23,261	13,537	139.2
Missouri	25,385	35,753	10,368	40.8
North Carolina	31,593	33,685	2,092	6.6
Oklahoma	21,480	23,983	2,503	11.7
South Carolina	21,172	25,006	3,834	18.1
Tennessee	16,342	26,489	10,147	62.1
Texas	148,964	154,139	5,175	3.5
Virginia	31,178	32,992	1,814	5.8
West Virginia	3,004	5,300	2,296	76.4
Total	504,903	598,079	105,025	21.3
Source: Developed by Legislative Auditor's staff from information contained in 1999 Adult Correctional Systems Report of the Louisiana Legislative Fiscal Office.				

As seen in Exhibit 2-2, the SLC states project a 21.3 percent increase in inmates in state facilities by the year 2004. Louisiana's adult inmate population housed in state facilities is projected to increase by 18.4 percent by 2004. Exhibit 2-2 does not include DOC inmates housed in local jails.

**Slight Secure
Juvenile
Population
Increase
Projected**

The number of juvenile inmates in secure custody is expected to increase slightly by June 2004. There were 2,039 juvenile inmates in secure custody as of June 1999, according to the DOC. The DOC has projected that the secure juvenile population in Louisiana will decline slightly to 1,970 through year 2002, before continuing to increase. DOC projects that there will be 2,095 juveniles in secure custody by June 2004. The juvenile operational capacity, reported to be 1,946 as of September 1999, is full.

**9,840 Adult
Inmate Beds
Needed in Next
Four Years to
Stay Near
Maximum
Inmate Capacity**

The DOC estimates that Louisiana's adult correctional facilities, work release centers, and local facilities need to add 9,840 beds through fiscal year 2002-03. According to information obtained from the DOC, the total operational capacity for Louisiana's adult correctional facilities, work release centers, and local facilities was 33,688 beds as of September 1999. The DOC has projected an increase of 9,840 beds by June 2003. This would bring the total of available beds to 43,528.

DOC projects that Louisiana's adult population in state prisons, work release centers, and local facilities will total 42,706 by June 2003. Thus, the additional capacity will be almost filled.

**Growth of Inmate
Population Could
Cost the State
an Additional
\$122 Million**

The addition of 9,840 beds in Louisiana's state and local facilities could cost the state more than \$122 million. According to projections obtained from the DOC, capital and operating costs for this planned expansion could total \$175 million by fiscal year 2002-03. The federal government will pay for more than \$52 million of the total capital costs associated with the expansion. Yet the largest share of these costs, more than \$122 million, would have to be borne by the State of Louisiana.

As was seen, Louisiana needs to add 9,840 beds at adult correctional facilities, work release centers, and local facilities between fiscal year 1999-2000 and fiscal year 2002-03. Total increased costs for new beds will be \$28 million in fiscal year 1999-2000, rising to \$46 million in fiscal year 2002-03, for a four-year total of more than \$175 million, if these beds are added.

The DOC has projected that increased capital costs for new adult inmate beds will total \$5.5 million in fiscal year 1999-2000 and \$83.5 million over four years. Louisiana's four-year share of these capital costs would be almost \$31 million.

Exhibit 2-3 on the following page shows the projected increases in beds and increased costs for fiscal years 1999-2000 through 2002-03.

Exhibit 2-3					
Increased Costs Associated With the Addition of Adult Inmate Beds					
Beds	FY 1999-00	FY 2000-01	FY 2001-02	FY 2002-03	Total
State	610	1,140	738	1,102	3,590
Local	1,850	1,400	1,600	1,400	6,250
Total	2,460	2,540	2,338	2,502	9,840
Costs*					
Total Capital	5.5	37.3	16.5	24.2	83.5
Federal	4.9	33.1	14.7	-\$0-	52.7
State	.6	4.2	1.8	24.2	30.8
Total Operating	22.6	27.3	20.2	21.8	91.9
Total Costs	28.1	64.6	36.7	46.0	175.4
Total Cost to Louisiana	23.2	31.5	22.0	46.0	122.7
Note: *Costs are expressed in millions of dollars.					
Source: Developed by Legislative Auditor's staff from information obtained from the DOC.					

The cost increases depicted in Exhibit 2-3 concern only the projected increase in adult inmates. Costs to house the present population may also continue to rise. From fiscal year 1998 to fiscal year 1999, total operating costs at Louisiana's adult correctional facilities rose from \$225 million to \$233 million, or more than \$8 million. During this same one-year period, the adult inmate population housed in state correctional facilities increased 561, from 17,651 to 18,212 inmates. In the same period, the costs to the state of housing adult state inmates in local jails rose from \$91 million to \$113 million, or \$22 million.

We have seen in this chapter that even the substantial increases in prison bed space planned for our state can be expected to do little more than keep us at virtually maximum prison capacity. As a result, it may be necessary to consider alternative means to control both the size and the costs of the prison population in Louisiana.

Matter for Legislative Consideration

- 2.1 The legislature, in consultation with DOC and other appropriate public and private agencies, may wish to consider means to fund projected continuing increases in Louisiana's adult and juvenile inmate populations.**

Recommendations

- 2.1 DOC should consider the most cost-effective and cost-efficient means of managing Louisiana's prison population. The department should examine all cost elements of the corrections system: administration, incarceration, rehabilitation, and health. Particular attention should be given to possibilities for controlling long-term costs, even if, in areas such as rehabilitation, these possibilities could require some short-term increases in funding.**
- 2.2 In addition, DOC should continue considering cost-effective and cost-efficient alternatives to traditional incarceration. These alternatives to traditional incarceration could include some or all of the following:**
- Community Confinement: Residence in a community treatment center, halfway house, restitution center, or other community facility**
 - Home Detention: Confinement and supervision that restricts the individual to his or her place of residence continuously, except for authorized absences, enforced by appropriate means of surveillance (e.g., electronic monitoring)**
 - Intermittent Confinement: Custody for intervals of time, such as weekends**
 - Community Service**

Chapter 3: Analysis of State Correctional Facility Costs

Chapter Conclusions

In fiscal year 1998-99, the direct operating expenditures for housing state adult and juvenile offenders was almost \$400 million. DOC spent \$233 million and \$51.3 million to operate the state adult and juvenile facilities, respectively. The department spent an additional \$115 million to house state offenders in local jail facilities. (Housing of state offenders in local jails is discussed in Chapter 5). These expenditures do not include certain administrative, capital and other costs associated with incarcerating offenders.

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$35.04 per day to house an offender in a state adult correctional facility. An average of \$39.20 per day was spent to house maximum security inmates, compared to an average of \$29.90 for minimum security inmates. The DOC's average expenditures to keep a juvenile offender in a Louisiana facility were \$72.86 per day.

Incarceration is, by far, the most expensive component of prison costs. In fiscal year 1998-99, it accounts for almost 77 percent of total adult facilities' expenditures, and for 61 percent of juvenile facilities' expenditures. In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$30.51 per day to provide only the incarceration portion of housing an adult offender in a maximum security state adult correctional facility. Salary is the largest component of incarceration costs. The physical plant layout and the custody categories of adult inmates affect the incarceration costs by affecting the number of correctional officers needed to control a facility.

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$4.39 per day to provide only the health care portion of keeping an inmate in a state adult correctional facility. DOC funded health care expenses represent only a portion of total state spending for the health of Louisiana's state inmates. The Louisiana State University Medical Center System (the charity hospitals) would have charged \$25 million in fiscal year 1998-99 for the treatment of state inmates and juvenile offenders. (The Medical Center System does not keep cost

information on services provided to inmates.) Using an estimate of \$12 million spent for adult offenders, charity hospital care would increase the average expenditure by \$1.03 from \$4.39 to \$5.42 per day for each adult inmate in a state correctional facility.

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$3.13 per day to provide only the administration portion of keeping an adult offender in a state prison. In fiscal year 1997-98, the DOC spent an average of \$4.29 per day. The main reason for this decrease is that a smaller amount of insurance premiums were paid in fiscal year 1998-99.

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$0.50 per day to provide only the rehabilitation portion of keeping an adult offender in a state prison. The Louisiana Community and Technical College System spent more than \$3.4 million to conduct courses at adult prisons. This System's expenditures average \$0.51 per day per inmate and thus increase the average expenditure to \$1.01 per day for each inmate in a Louisiana adult correctional facility.

The DOC spent more than \$51.3 million in fiscal year 1998-99, to keep juvenile offenders in Louisiana facilities. This averages \$72.86 per day for each juvenile offender. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average spent for each offender was \$72.11. DOC spends a much larger proportion of total juvenile facilities' expenditures on juvenile rehabilitation programs (11 percent) than the percentage of total adult facilities' expenditures spent on adult rehabilitation (1.4 percent). This is because juvenile offenders must be provided a comprehensive education.

DOC entered into cooperative endeavor agreements for the operation of Jena and Tallulah. These agreements originally obligated DOC for 25 years or until principal and interest on debt incurred to construct the facilities is paid off. However, the agreement with the City of Tallulah was amended several times. One amendment provided that DOC would pay debt principal and interest, property taxes, and insurance in the event DOC took over operation of Tallulah. A later amendment consolidated these specific costs, in the event of a takeover, into a reduced per diem of \$16.62 for 686 offenders. This amounts to \$4.2 million annually. DOC assumed operation of Tallulah in September 1999. Under

provisions of the contract, the per diem does not reduce once the facility's construction debt has been repaid. DOC is in negotiations with the contractor concerning contract provisions.

**Housing State
Adult and
Juvenile
Offenders Costs
\$400 Million**

In fiscal year 1998-99, the direct operating costs of housing state adult and juvenile offenders was almost \$400 million. Operating the state adult and juvenile facilities cost \$233 million and \$51.3 million, respectively. This combined cost of \$284 million does not include expenditures for housing state offenders in local jail facilities, which was \$115 million. Thus, the DOC spent almost \$400 million in fiscal year 1998-99 to house state adult and juvenile offenders. As discussed later in this chapter, these expenditures do not include certain administrative, capital, and other costs associated with incarcerating offenders. This chapter discusses the costs of housing offenders in state correctional facilities. Chapter 5 discusses the housing of state offenders in local jail facilities.

Each Adult Offender Costs an Average of \$35.04 Per Day

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$35.04 per day to house offenders in state adult correctional facilities. This average is derived from only the operating expenditures made by each facility (as provided to us by DOC) during fiscal year 1998-99, and does not include other costs that are discussed later in this chapter. During fiscal year 1998-99, Louisiana's adult correctional facilities housed an average of 18,212 offenders. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average cost per day for housing an adult inmate was \$34.87.

Exhibit 3-1 on page 28 shows the direct operating costs at each of Louisiana's adult correctional facilities in fiscal years 1998 and 1999. For adult inmates, there are three basic types of custody. Level I offenders are considered maximum security; Level II are considered medium security; and Level III are considered minimum security.

Exhibit 3-1					
Louisiana's Adult Correctional Facilities					
Direct Operating Expenditures					
Fiscal Years 1997-98 and 1998-99					
Facility	Fiscal Year 1997-98		Fiscal Year 1998-99		
	Actual Expenditures	Daily Cost Per Inmate	Actual Expenditures	Daily Cost Per Inmate	Number of Inmates
Level I					
Angola	\$72,636,071	\$39.02	\$74,720,025	\$40.00	5,118
Hunt**	\$30,026,178	\$41.15	\$30,687,836	\$39.88	2,108
Wade	\$18,194,466	\$37.82	\$19,704,777	\$37.83	1,427
LCIW	\$10,955,026	\$34.30	\$11,628,149	\$35.28	903
Totals-Level I	\$131,811,741	\$38.86	\$136,740,787	\$39.20	9,556
Level II					
WCI	\$15,008,019	\$37.04	\$15,398,938	\$35.22	1,198
Dixon	\$20,071,612	\$35.36	\$20,605,041	\$35.53	1,589
Avoyelles	\$14,186,413	\$26.28	\$14,544,967	\$25.91	1,538
Winn*	\$14,046,048*	\$26.11	\$14,900,903*	\$27.02	1,511
Allen*	\$13,617,702*	\$25.33	\$14,355,401*	\$25.91	1,518
Phelps	\$10,613,879	\$37.00	\$11,025,893	\$37.25	811
Totals-Level II	\$87,543,673	\$30.45	\$90,831,143	\$30.48	8,165
Level III					
WTF-N	\$5,289,066	\$30.06	\$5,357,824	\$29.90	491
TOTALS	\$224,644,480	\$34.87	\$232,929,754	\$35.04	18,212
Notes: *These figures are calculated on the basis of DOC contract payments to the private companies managing these facilities plus some DOC administration costs.					
**Includes expenditures for the Adult Reception and Diagnostic Center (ARDC) where inmates initially go to be screened and classified.					
Source: Developed by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC.					

\$39.20 Per Day Spent on Maximum Security Offenders

In fiscal year 1998-99, the average cost to keep an offender in a Level I (Maximum Security) state adult correctional facility in Louisiana was \$39.20 per day. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average cost per day was \$38.86. Fifty-two percent (9,556 of 18,212) of all offenders in state adult correctional facilities were detained in

Level I facilities in fiscal year 1998-99. However, 59 percent of the total facilities' direct operating expenditures were spent for these four state facilities.

\$30.48 Per Day Spent on Medium Security Offenders

In fiscal year 1998-99, the average cost to keep an offender in a Level II (Medium Security) state correctional facility in Louisiana was \$30.48 per day. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average cost per day was \$30.45. Nearly 45 percent (8,165 of 18,212) of all adult offenders in state facilities were held in Level II facilities in 1998-99. However, only 39 percent of the total facilities' operating expenditures were for these six facilities.

\$29.90 Per Day Spent on Minimum Security Offenders

In fiscal year 1998-99, the average cost to keep an offender in the one Level III (Minimum Security) state correctional facility in Louisiana was \$29.90. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average cost per day was \$30.06. Almost 3 percent of all adult offenders in state facilities were held in this Level III facility in 1998-99. More than 2 percent of the total facilities' operating expenditures were for this one facility (Work Training Facility-North).

Incarceration Represents 77 Percent of Prison Costs

In fiscal year 1998-99, 77 percent of DOC's prison operating expenditures were for incarceration. In fiscal year 1997-98, the proportion was slightly lower, totaling almost three out of every four dollars. Exhibit 3-2 on the following page presents DOC's operating costs. As can be seen in Exhibit 3-2, DOC's rehabilitation spending was 1.4 percent of DOC's operating costs. In fiscal year 1998-99, almost 13 percent of operating costs was spent for health services and almost 9 percent was spent for administration. The factors that influence incarceration costs are discussed later in this chapter.

Exhibit 3-2				
Louisiana's Adult Correctional Institutions				
Administration, Incarceration, Rehabilitation, and Health Costs				
Fiscal Years 1997-98 and 1998-99				
	Fiscal Year 1997-98		Fiscal Year 1998-99	
	Actual Expenditures	Percentage of Total Costs	Actual Expenditures	Percentage of Total Costs
Administration	\$27,625,850	12.3	\$20,807,328	8.9
Incarceration	\$167,567,256	74.6	\$179,598,661	77.1
Rehabilitation	\$3,056,457	1.4	\$3,330,890	1.4
Health	\$26,394,917	11.7	\$29,192,875	12.6
Totals	\$224,644,480	100.0	\$232,929,754	100.0
Note: Amounts for Winn and Allen included in this exhibit are an allocation of the contract payments to these facilities by DOC. The allocation is based on cost data that was provided to us by Winn and Allen.				
Source: Prepared by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC.				

Average of \$30.51 Per Day Spent on Level I Incarceration

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$30.51 per day to provide only the incarceration portion of keeping an offender in a Level I (Maximum Security) state adult correctional facility. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average cost was \$29.39 per day. Fifty-nine percent of the total spent on incarceration expenses for state adult correctional facilities in fiscal year 1998-99 was spent for Level I facilities. Incarceration costs include expenditures for providing security for inmates, such as correctional officer salaries and benefits. In addition, incarceration costs include food, clothing, and laundry for inmates and also maintenance of buildings. Of these cost factors, staff salaries comprise by far the largest part. Exhibit 3-3 on page 31 shows DOC's incarceration expenditures for each adult facility.

Exhibit 3-3					
Incarceration Costs at Louisiana's Adult Correctional Facilities					
Fiscal Years 1997-98 and 1998-99					
Facility	Fiscal Year 1997-98		Fiscal Year 1998-99		
	Actual Expenditures	Daily Cost Per Inmate	Actual Expenditures	Daily Cost Per Inmate	Number of Inmates
Level I					
Angola	\$55,580,385	\$29.86	\$58,848,472	\$31.50	5,118
Hunt**	\$22,014,097	\$30.17	\$23,496,325	\$30.54	2,108
Wade	\$14,205,103	\$29.53	\$15,671,915	\$30.09	1,427
LCIW	\$7,894,936	\$24.72	\$8,398,710	\$25.48	903
Totals-Level I	\$99,694,521	\$29.39	\$106,415,422	\$30.51	9,556
Level II					
WCI	\$11,358,439	\$28.04	\$12,516,489	\$28.62	1,198
Dixon***	\$16,174,214	\$28.50	\$17,260,560	\$30.41	1,589
Avoyelles	\$10,531,532	\$19.51	\$11,371,151	\$20.26	1,538
Winn*	\$8,104,816	\$15.06	\$8,634,494	\$15.66	1,511
Allen*	\$9,310,373	\$17.32	\$10,123,032	\$18.27	1,518
Phelps	\$8,190,338	\$28.55	\$8,918,187	\$30.13	811
Totals-Level II	\$63,669,712	\$22.15	\$68,823,913	\$23.09	8,165
Level III					
WTF-N	\$4,203,021	\$23.89	\$4,359,326	\$24.32	491
Total	\$167,567,254	\$26.01	\$179,598,661	\$27.02	18,212
<p>Note: *These amounts are an allocation of the contract payments to these facilities by DOC. The allocation is based on cost data that was provided to us by Winn and Allen.</p> <p>**Includes the Adult Reception and Diagnostic Center (ARDC).</p> <p>***Includes the Blue Walters Substance Abuse/Pre-Release Center.</p> <p>Source: Prepared by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC, Allen, and Winn.</p>					

Average of \$23.09 Per Day Spent on Level II Incarceration

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$23.09 per day to provide only the incarceration portion of keeping an offender in a Level II (Medium Security) state adult correctional facility. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average cost was \$22.15 per day. Thirty-eight percent of the total spent on incarceration

expenses for state adult correctional facilities in fiscal year 1998-99 was spent for Level II facilities.

Average of \$24.32 Per Day Spent on Level III Incarceration

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$24.32 per day to provide only the incarceration portion of keeping an offender in a Level III (Minimum Security) state adult correctional facility. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average cost was \$23.89 per day. Two percent of the total spent on incarceration expenses for state adult correctional facilities in fiscal year 1998-99 was spent for the Level III facility.

Administrative Expense for All Inmates Averages \$3.13 Per Day

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$3.13 per day to provide only the administrative portion of keeping an inmate in a state adult correctional facility. In fiscal year 1997-98 the DOC spent an average of \$4.29 per day. Administrative services include the expenses of the warden's office as well as the business office at each prison. Exhibit 3-4 on page 33 shows that administrative costs declined dramatically for most facilities between fiscal years 1997-98 and 1998-99. The main reason for this decrease is that a smaller amount of insurance premiums were paid in fiscal year 1998-99.

Average of \$2.82 Per Day Spent on Level I Administration

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$2.82 per day to provide only the administrative portion of keeping an inmate in a Level I (Maximum Security) state adult correctional facility. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average cost was \$4.17 per day. Forty-seven percent of the total facilities' administrative expenditures were for the four Level I facilities. The administrative expenses of each facility do not include allocation of any DOC headquarters' administration expenses. Exhibit 3-4 on page 33 shows DOC's administrative expenditures for each adult correctional facility.

Exhibit 3-4					
Administrative Costs at Louisiana's Adult Correctional Facilities					
Fiscal Years 1997-98 and 1998-99					
Facility	Fiscal Year 1997-98		Fiscal Year 1998-99		
	Actual Expenditures	Daily Cost Per Inmate	Actual Expenditures	Daily Cost Per Inmate	Number of Inmates
Level I					
Angola	\$6,986,848	\$3.75	\$4,650,713	\$2.49	5,118
Hunt	\$3,818,965	\$5.23	\$2,459,157	\$3.20	2,108
Wade	\$2,167,223	\$4.51	\$1,827,512	\$3.51	1,427
LCIW	\$1,153,937	\$3.61	\$886,365	\$2.69	903
Totals-Level I	\$14,126,973	\$4.17	\$9,823,747	\$2.82	9,556
Level II					
WCI	\$2,139,448	\$5.28	\$1,139,201	\$2.61	1,198
Dixon	\$2,011,962	\$3.54	\$1,360,664	\$2.35	1,589
Avoyelles	\$1,744,128	\$3.23	\$1,210,347	\$2.16	1,538
Winn*	\$4,059,266	\$7.54	\$4,254,233	\$7.71	1,511
Allen*	\$1,366,632	\$2.54	\$1,358,563	\$2.45	1,518
Phelps	\$1,482,737	\$5.17	\$1,103,974	\$3.73	811
Totals-Level II	\$12,804,173	\$4.45	\$10,426,982	\$3.50	8,165
Level III					
WTF-N	\$694,704	\$3.95	\$556,599	\$3.11	491
Total	\$27,625,850	\$4.29	\$20,807,328	\$3.13	18,212
<p>Note: *These amounts are an allocation of the contract payments to these facilities by DOC. The allocation is based on cost data that was provided to us by Winn and Allen.</p> <p>Source: Prepared by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC, Winn, and Allen.</p>					

Average of \$3.50 Per Day Spent on Level II Administration

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$3.50 per day to provide only the administrative portion of keeping an inmate in a Level II state adult correctional facility. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average cost was \$4.45 per day. Fifty percent of the total facilities' administrative expenditures were for the six Level II facilities. The administrative expenses of each facility do not include allocation of any DOC headquarters' administration expenses.

Average of \$3.11 Per Day Spent on Level III Administration

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$3.11 per day to provide only the administrative portion of keeping an inmate in a Level III state adult correctional facility. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average cost was \$3.95 per day. Approximately 3 percent of the total facilities' administrative expenditures were for the Work Training Facility-North. The administrative expenses of each facility do not include allocation of any DOC headquarters' administration expenses.

Health Expense for All Inmates Is \$4.39 Per Day

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$4.39 per day to provide only the health care portion of keeping an inmate in a state adult correctional facility. In fiscal year 1997-98, the DOC spent an average of \$4.10 per day. Health care includes physical and mental health services and substance abuse programs. As discussed later in this chapter, the LSU Medical Center System also provides health care services for adult and juvenile offenders. Using an estimate of \$12 million spent by the LSU Medical Center System for all state adult offenders, charity hospital care would increase the average cost \$1.03 per day, from to \$4.39 to \$5.42. (The \$1.03 is computed by taking \$12 million, dividing by total inmates (31,941) and dividing this by 365 days.)

Average of \$5.58 Per Day Spent on Level I Health Care

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$5.58 per day to provide only the health care portion of keeping an offender in a Level I state adult correctional facility. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average cost per day was \$5.02. Sixty-seven percent of the total facilities' health care expenditures were for the four Level I facilities.

Exhibit 3-5 on page 35 shows DOC's health care expenditures at each adult facility. The figures shown in Exhibit 3-5 do not reflect all costs associated with health care of the inmates in Louisiana's adult correctional facilities.

Based on our conservative estimate that \$12 million is spent by charity hospitals for adult inmates, health costs per inmate would be \$6.89 per day for Level I facilities. This is computed by taking 67 percent (Level I expenditures as a percentage of total

health expenditures) of \$12 million times the percentage of total adult offenders held in state facilities. We divided this amount by the number of Level I offenders (9,556) and 365 days to obtain the increased per diem (\$1.31). This amount is added to DOC's health costs to total \$6.89.

Exhibit 3-5					
DOC's Health Costs at Louisiana's Adult Correctional Facilities					
Fiscal Years 1997-98 and 1998-99					
Facility	Fiscal Year 1997-98		Fiscal Year 1998-99		
	Actual Expenditures	Daily Cost Per Inmate	Actual Expenditures	Daily Cost Per Inmate	Number of Inmates
Level I					
Angola	\$9,545,123	\$5.13	\$10,678,355	\$5.72	5,118
Hunt	\$3,960,361	\$5.43	\$4,508,289	\$5.86	2,108
Wade	\$1,737,789	\$3.61	\$2,116,595	\$4.06	1,427
LCIW	\$1,791,778	\$5.61	\$2,175,568	\$6.60	903
Totals-Level I	\$17,035,051	\$5.02	\$19,478,807	\$5.58	9,556
Level II					
WCI	\$1,356,178	\$3.35	\$1,583,854	\$3.62	1,198
Dixon	\$1,683,480	\$2.97	\$1,778,300	\$3.07	1,589
Avoyelles	\$1,757,998	\$3.26	\$1,810,008	\$3.22	1,538
Winn*	\$1,370,001	\$2.55	\$1,402,601	\$2.54	1,511
Allen*	\$1,976,875	\$3.67	\$1,806,272	\$3.26	1,518
Phelps	\$823,993	\$2.87	\$891,134	\$3.01	811
Totals-Level II	\$8,968,525	\$3.12	\$9,272,169	\$3.11	8,165
Level III					
WTF-N	\$391,341	\$2.22	\$441,899	\$2.47	491
Total	\$26,394,917	\$4.10	\$29,192,875	\$4.39	18,212
<p>Note: *These amounts are an allocation of the contract payments to these facilities by DOC. The allocation is based on cost data that was provided to us by Winn and Allen.</p> <p>Source: Prepared by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC, Allen, and Winn.</p>					

Average of \$3.11 Per Day Spent on Level II Health Care

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$3.11 per day to provide only the health care portion of keeping an offender in a Level II state adult correctional facility. In fiscal year

1997-98, the average cost per day was \$3.12. Thirty-two percent of the total facilities' health care expenditures were for the six Level II facilities. If our estimate of expenses incurred by the LSU Medical Center System for Level II offenders kept at state adult facilities is factored into health costs, the average cost per inmate rises to \$3.84 per day.

Average of \$2.47 Per Day Spent on Level III Health Care

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$2.47 per day to provide only the health care portion of keeping an offender in a Level III state adult correctional facility. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average cost per day was \$2.22. Less than 2 percent of the total facilities' health care expenditures were for the one Level III facility. If our estimate of expenses incurred by the LSU Medical Center System for Level III offenders kept at state adult facilities is factored into health costs, the average cost per inmate rises to \$3.05 per day.

Rehabilitation Expense for All Inmates Is \$0.50 Per Day

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$0.50 per day to provide only the rehabilitation portion of keeping an inmate in a state adult correctional facility. In fiscal year 1997-98, the DOC spent an average of \$0.47 per day. DOC's rehabilitation includes expenditures for literacy and job skills courses, recreation, libraries, and religious activities. The Louisiana Community and Technical College System spent more than \$3.4 million in fiscal year 1998-99 to provide academic and vocational-technical courses at most of the state's adult prisons. These vocational-technical expenditures result in an average of \$0.51 per day, to total \$1.01 spent per day for each offender in a state adult facility.

Average of \$0.29 Per Day Spent on Level I Rehabilitation

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$0.29 per day to provide only the rehabilitation portion of keeping an offender in a Level I state adult correctional facility. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average cost per day was \$0.28. Thirty percent of the total facilities' rehabilitation expenditures were for the four Level I facilities. Exhibit 3-6 on page 38 shows DOC's rehabilitation expenditures at each adult facility.

Exhibit 3-6 does not include expenditures of the Louisiana Community and Technical College System for adult inmate education, which were more than \$3.4 million in fiscal year

1998-99. If the Community and Technical College System expenditures are included, the expenditures to provide rehabilitation services to an offender in a Level I state adult facility rise to \$0.89 per day. Rehabilitation programs, and their possible impact on recidivism rates, will be discussed more extensively in Chapter 6.

Average of \$0.77 Per Day Spent on Level II Rehabilitation

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$0.77 per day to provide only the rehabilitation portion of keeping an offender in a Level II state adult correctional facility. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average cost per day was \$0.73. Sixty-nine percent of the total facilities' rehabilitation expenditures were for the six Level II facilities. If the Community and Technical College System expenditures discussed previously are included, rehabilitation expenditures for an offender housed in a Level II state adult facility rise to \$1.20 per day.

Exhibit 3-6					
DOC Rehabilitation Costs					
at Louisiana's Adult Correctional Facilities					
Fiscal Years 1997-98 and 1998-99					
Facility	Fiscal Year 1997-98		Fiscal Year 1998-99		
	Actual Expenditures	Daily Cost Per Inmate	Actual Expenditures	Daily Cost Per Inmate	Number of Inmates
Level I					
Angola	\$523,715	\$0.28	\$542,486	\$0.29	5,118
Hunt	\$232,755	\$0.32	\$224,065	\$0.29	2,108
Wade	\$84,351	\$0.18	\$88,755	\$0.17	1,427
LCIW	\$114,375	\$0.36	\$167,506	\$0.51	903
Totals-Level I	\$955,196	\$0.28	\$1,022,812	\$0.29	9,556
Level II					
WCI	\$153,954	\$0.38	\$159,394	\$0.36	1,198
Dixon	\$201,956	\$0.36	\$205,517	0.35	1,589
Avoyelles	\$152,755	\$0.28	\$153,461	\$0.27	1,538
Winn*	\$511,964	\$0.95	\$609,575	\$1.11	1,511
Allen*	\$963,821	\$1.79	\$1,067,533	\$1.93	1,518
Phelps	\$116,811	\$0.41	\$112,598	\$0.38	811
Totals-Level II	\$2,101,261	\$0.73	\$2,308,078	\$0.77	8,165
Level III					
WTF-N	0	0	0	0	491
Totals	\$3,056,457	\$0.47	\$3,330,890	\$0.50	18,212
Note: *These amounts are an allocation of the contract payments to these facilities by DOC. The allocation is based on cost data that was provided to us by Winn and Allen.					
Source: Prepared by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC.					

DOC Expends \$0 on Level III Rehabilitation

In both fiscal years 1997 and 1998, the DOC did not expend any funds to provide only the rehabilitation portion of keeping an offender in the Work Training Facility-North. Many of the inmates at this correctional facility have job assignments during the day. In fiscal year 1998-99, the Louisiana Community and Technical College System spent \$64,019 for rehabilitation programs at the Work Training Facility-North, which results in an average cost of \$.36 per offender per day.

**DOC's Cost Data
Do Not Reflect
All Costs of
Operating a
Facility**

Other costs associated with incarcerating offenders are not included in DOC's cost data. DOC incurs administrative costs at its headquarters to oversee and provide support to the facilities. In fiscal year 1998-99, DOC spent the following amounts for some of its administrative functions in certain programs:

- Adult Services program \$1.2 million
- Office of the Secretary \$1.5 million
- Office of Management and Finance \$17.3 million
- Office of Youth Development \$1.3 million

Although only a portion of these expenditures relates to prison administration and management, none of these costs are allocated to the individual institutions. Also, if DOC sends an inspection team or other assistance to a facility, the costs associated with such activity are not charged to the facility receiving the services. However, if DOC provides a security presence at a private juvenile facility in an emergency situation, then it is reimbursed, according to a DOC official.

Other costs not included in DOC's cost data are capital costs such as depreciation of a facility and any interest incurred on debt to finance the facility's construction. In addition, as already discussed in this chapter, there are costs associated with services provided by other governmental entities, such as the Louisiana Community and Technical College System and the LSU Medical Center System.

**LSU Medical
Center System
Spends Millions
to Care for
Incarcerated**

The LSU Medical Center System (the charity hospitals) estimates patient charges of more than \$22 million in fiscal year 1997-98 and more than \$25 million in fiscal year 1998-99 for the treatment of both adult and juvenile offenders. According to an official at the Medical Center System, these figures are based on what the hospitals would charge for providing these medical services, not the actual costs of those services. The LSU Medical Center hospitals reported 12,339 inmate/offender inpatient days and 36,991 inmate/offender outpatient visits in fiscal year 1997-98. In fiscal year 1998-99, inpatient days dropped to 11,348, but outpatient visits rose to 50,933 days. These figures include services provided to DOC inmates housed in local jails.

Without complete cost information, it is difficult to know what it really costs the state to incarcerate an offender. A decision maker can review DOC's cost information for Level I facilities and think that health costs were \$5.58 per inmate per day in fiscal year 1998-99. However, the true cost of providing Level I health care is higher because health care services were provided to all the state's offenders by the LSU Medical Center System in that year.

The omission of relevant costs also makes it difficult to compare accurately one facility with another facility. For example, DOC's daily operational expenditures for Allen and Avoyelles were the same (\$25.91) for each inmate in fiscal year 1998-99. However, the Louisiana Community and Technical College System spent almost \$300,000 at Avoyelles and \$95,242 at Allen. Is it cheaper to house an inmate at Allen? What other costs of incarcerating offenders should be considered in computing the cost per offender per day?

If the DOC could develop a cost model that portrayed costs of incarceration more completely, the legislature, DOC and other parties would have more accurate information for decision-making purposes. *This model should include capital costs, costs of services furnished by other governmental entities, and an allocation to each facility of the appropriate amount of DOC's headquarters' administrative expenses.*

Recommendations

- 3.1 To furnish decision makers with more accurate information, DOC should develop a cost model that considers all costs of operating a correctional facility. This model should portray different components of costs to assist decision makers in comparing one facility with another.**
- 3.2 All state agencies furnishing services to offenders should cooperate with the DOC by capturing data on costs of incarceration and providing this information quarterly to DOC.**

Matter for Legislative Consideration

- 3.1 The legislature may wish to mandate that other state agencies capture cost data on services provided to offenders and furnish this information quarterly to DOC.**

Housing a Juvenile Costs More Than \$72 Per Day

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC's average expenditures to keep a juvenile offender in a Louisiana juvenile facility were \$72.86 per day. This average is derived from only the operating expenditures made by the DOC (as provided to us by DOC) during the 1998-99 fiscal year and does not include other costs that have been previously discussed. During fiscal year 1998-99, Louisiana's juvenile correctional facilities housed an average of 1,931 offenders. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average expenditures per day for housing a juvenile offender were \$72.11. Exhibit 3-7 on page 42 shows the average expenditures for each of the five facilities.

Bridge City is the most expensive juvenile facility on an offender per day basis. The DOC spent an average of \$92.63 per offender each day at Bridge City in fiscal year 1998-99. As can be seen in Exhibit 3-7, in fiscal year 1998-99, the two privately managed facilities (Jena and Tallulah) were cheaper on a daily expenditure per offender basis than were the three state-managed facilities. Jena opened in December 1998, so no cost data is available for fiscal year 1997-98.

Exhibit 3-7					
Direct Operating Costs of Louisiana's Juvenile Correctional Facilities Fiscal Years 1997-98 and 1998-99					
Facility	Fiscal Year 1997-98		Fiscal Year 1998-99		
	Actual Expenditures	Daily Cost Per Offender	Actual Expenditures	Daily Cost Per Offender	Number of Offenders
Bridge City	\$5,682,939	\$88.46	\$5,883,067	\$92.63	174
Jetson	\$16,126,038	\$69.91	\$16,404,061	\$74.04	607
Swanson	\$10,939,244	\$70.69	\$11,666,558	\$84.78	377
Jena*	0	0	\$3,451,140	\$70.00	235
Tallulah*	\$14,865,173	\$70.58	\$13,947,655	\$71.03	538
TOTALS	\$47,613,394	\$72.11	\$51,352,481	\$72.86	1,931
<p>Note: *These figures are contract payments to the private companies managing these facilities.</p> <p>Note: Jena opened in December 1998. Hence, there are no expenditures for fiscal year 1997-98.</p> <p>Source: Developed by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC.</p>					

Exhibit 3-8 on page 43 presents DOC's expenditures for the three state-managed facilities broken into the categories of health care, administration, incarceration, and rehabilitation. In Exhibits 3-8 through 3-12, we allocated amounts for the four cost categories for Jena and Tallulah. DOC does not have a breakdown of these cost categories for these two facilities because a per diem amount was paid for each offender in fiscal years 1998 and 1999. We used cost data provided by these two privately managed facilities as a basis for allocating into the four cost categories DOC's per diem payments for operating these two facilities.

**DOC Spends Less
for Juvenile
Incarceration
Than for Adult
Incarceration**

In juvenile institutions, incarceration represents a smaller overall percentage of DOC expenditures than it does for adult facilities. It can be seen from Exhibit 3-8 that incarceration expenditures represent the largest part of DOC spending for the state's juvenile institutions. While this was also true for adult facilities, DOC is spending less for juvenile incarceration expenses, as a percentage of overall operating expenditures, than it does for the incarceration of adults.

DOC spends a much larger proportion on juvenile rehabilitation programs than on adult programs. While one percent of DOC spending for adult facilities goes to adult rehabilitation programs, the corresponding figure for juveniles is 11 percent.

DOC regulations require that juvenile offenders receive a comprehensive educational program that includes a broad variety of components appropriate to the needs of offenders. These components must include programs for levels up to the completion of a high school diploma or a GED, available at no cost to the juvenile offender.

Exhibit 3-8				
Louisiana's Juvenile Correctional Facility Costs				
Administration, Incarceration, Rehabilitation, and Health				
Fiscal Years 1997-98 and 1998-99				
	Fiscal Year 1997-98		Fiscal Year 1998-99	
	Actual Expenditures	Percentage of Total Costs	Actual Expenditures	Percentage of Total Costs
Administration	\$6,101,142	12.8	\$6,602,860	12.9
Incarceration	\$29,848,530	62.7	\$31,416,078	61.1
Rehabilitation	\$4,876,658	10.2	\$5,618,349	11.0
Health	\$6,787,064	14.3	\$7,715,194	15.0
Total	\$47,613,394	100.0	\$51,352,481	100.0
Note: Amounts for Tallulah and Jena included in this exhibit are an allocation of the contract payments to these facilities by DOC. The allocation is based on cost data that were provided to us by Jena and Tallulah.				
Source: Prepared by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC.				

**Incarceration
Expense for
Juveniles
Averages \$44.57
Per Day**

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$44.57 per day to provide only the incarceration portion of keeping an offender in a juvenile correctional facility. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average expenditure was \$45.21 per day. Incarceration includes expenditures for providing security for offenders, such as correctional officer salaries and benefits. Incarceration costs also include maintenance of buildings and food, clothing, and laundry for offenders. Exhibit 3-9 below shows the incarceration expenditures for Louisiana's five juvenile facilities.

Exhibit 3-9 Incarceration Costs at Louisiana's Juvenile Correctional Facilities Fiscal Years 1997-98 and 1998-99					
Facility	Fiscal Year 1997-98		Fiscal Year 1998-99		
	Actual Expenditures	Daily Cost Per Offender	Actual Expenditures	Daily Cost Per Offender	Number of Offenders
Bridge City	\$3,581,301	\$55.75	\$3,900,567	\$61.42	174
Jetson	\$9,508,327	\$41.22	\$10,151,209	\$45.82	607
Swanson	\$6,472,456	\$41.82	\$7,039,379	\$51.16	377
Tallulah*	\$10,286,446	\$48.84	\$8,187,370	\$41.69	538
Jena*	0	0	\$2,137,553	\$43.36	235
Totals	\$29,848,530	\$45.21	\$31,416,078	\$44.57	1,931
<p>Note: *These amounts are an allocation of the contract payments to these facilities by DOC. The allocation is based on cost data that were provided to us by Jena and Tallulah. Source: Prepared by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC.</p>					

**Administrative
Expense
Averages \$9.37
Per Day for Each
Juvenile Offender**

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$9.37 per day to provide only the administrative portion of keeping an offender in a juvenile correctional facility. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average expenditure was \$9.24 per day. Administrative expenses are for operation of the warden's office as well as the business office at each prison. The administrative expenses do not include any allocation of administrative expenses

incurred at DOC's headquarters. Exhibit 3-10 shows the administrative expenditures for Louisiana's five juvenile facilities.

Exhibit 3-10					
Administrative Costs at Louisiana's Juvenile Correctional Facilities					
Fiscal Years 1997-98 and 1998-99					
Facility	Fiscal Year 1997-98		Fiscal Year 1998-99		
	Actual Expenditures	Daily Cost Per Offender	Actual Expenditures	Daily Cost Per Offender	Number of Offenders
Bridge City	\$827,997	\$12.89	\$617,649	\$9.73	174
Jetson	\$1,910,925	\$8.28	\$1,017,431	\$4.59	607
Swanson	\$1,346,623	\$8.70	\$1,135,967	\$8.26	377
Tallulah*	\$2,015,597	\$9.53	\$3,183,052	\$16.21	538
Jena*	0	0	\$648,761	\$13.16	235
Total	\$6,101,142	\$9.24	\$6,602,860	\$9.37	1,931
<p>Note: *These amounts are an allocation of the contract payments to these facilities by DOC. The allocation is based on cost data that were provided to us by Jena and Tallulah.</p> <p>Source: Prepared by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC.</p>					

Administrative Costs Declined in Fiscal Year 1998-99

The amount spent on administration, both in absolute terms and on a daily per-offender basis, has decreased for all three DOC-managed institutions between fiscal years 1997-98 and 1998-99. The main reason for this decrease is the same as it was with the adult institutions: lower insurance costs were incurred in fiscal year 1998-99.

Jetson has the lowest per-offender administration cost in both fiscal years. Since Jetson has the largest inmate population, its relatively low per-offender administration costs probably result from economies of scale.

**Health Expense
Averages \$10.95
Per Day for Each
Juvenile Offender**

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of **\$10.95** per day to provide only the health portion of keeping an offender in a juvenile correctional facility. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average expenditure was \$10.28 per day. Health care includes physical health services, mental health services, and substance abuse programs. Exhibit 3-11 summarizes the juvenile facilities' health care costs.

If an estimate of expenses incurred by the LSU Medical Center System for juvenile offenders kept at state juvenile correctional facilities is factored into health costs, the average cost per offender rises to \$13.56 per day. (This is based on our estimated cost of \$2 million spent by the LSU Medical Center System to care for all secure juvenile offenders.)

Exhibit 3-11 Health Care Costs at Louisiana's Juvenile Correctional Facilities Fiscal Years 1997-98 and 1998-99					
Facility	Fiscal Year 1997-98		Fiscal Year 1998-99		
	Actual Expenditures	Daily Cost Per Inmate	Actual Expenditures	Daily Cost Per Inmate	Number of Inmates
Bridge City	\$686,186	\$10.68	\$693,447	\$10.92	174
Jetson	\$3,054,694	\$13.24	\$3,357,731	\$15.16	607
Swanson	\$1,579,085	\$10.20	\$1,684,164	\$12.24	377
Tallulah*	\$1,467,099	\$6.97	\$1,615,342	\$8.23	538
Jena*	0	0	\$364,510	\$7.39	235
Totals	\$6,787,064	\$10.28	\$7,715,194	\$10.95	1,931
<p>Note: *These amounts are an allocation of the contract payments to these facilities by DOC. The allocation is based on cost data that were provided to us by Jena and Tallulah. Source: Prepared by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC.</p>					

Jetson's health care costs are somewhat higher than the other facilities. Jetson's institutional responsibilities and inmate population result in higher health care costs than other facilities. Health costs at Jetson are increased by its status as the juvenile intake facility, according to a DOC official. As the intake facility,

it must do more health screening than other facilities. In addition, Jetson is the only juvenile facility having females among its population. According to medical staff at Jetson, health care for females is more expensive than for male juveniles. Jetson, therefore, has health care responsibilities and resulting costs not shared by other juvenile facilities.

**DOC's
Rehabilitation
Expense
Averages \$7.97
Per Day for Each
Juvenile**

In fiscal year 1998-99, the DOC spent an average of \$7.97 per day to provide only the rehabilitation portion of keeping an offender in a juvenile correctional facility. In fiscal year 1997-98, the average expenditure was \$7.39 per day. Rehabilitation expenses are for academic and vocational-technical courses, recreation, libraries, and religious activities. Exhibit 3-12 on page 48 shows DOC's rehabilitation expenditures at each juvenile facility.

Swanson has the highest per-offender rehabilitation expenditures. Jetson has the lowest rehabilitation expenditures. Special programs and responsibilities affect rehabilitation expenditures. According to the DOC Secretary, Swanson's rehabilitation costs increased in fiscal year 1998-99 because of a mental health unit added at that facility. The new unit increased staff by 23.

The Secretary also said that Jetson's status as the juvenile intake facility, which increases its health care expenses, reduces its per-offender rehabilitation expenses. That is because offenders who are staying at Jetson during their limited intake process do not participate in rehabilitation programs at that facility. Thus, the per-offender daily average for Jetson rehabilitation expenditures is decreased.

In addition to DOC's rehabilitation expenditures, Special School District #1 and two other school districts spent approximately \$4.5 million in fiscal year 1998-99 for education at juvenile facilities. The Special School District #1 spent \$1,647,691 to provide educational courses at Jetson, Swanson, and Bridge City in fiscal year 1998-99, according to a budget analyst at the Department of Education. The LaSalle Parish School Board also spent \$974,000 at Jena in the same fiscal year, according to LaSalle Parish School Board officials. The Madison Parish School Board spent more than \$1.9 million, according to an administration official at this school board. Special School District #2 now provides educational services for Jena and Tallulah. More than

\$3.5 million was appropriated for education at these two juvenile facilities in fiscal year 1999-2000.

Exhibit 3-12					
Rehabilitation Costs					
Louisiana's Juvenile Correctional Facilities					
Fiscal Years 1997-98 and 1998-99					
Facility	Fiscal Year 1997-98		Fiscal Year 1998-99		
	Actual Expenditures	Daily Cost Per Inmate	Actual Expenditures	Daily Cost Per Inmate	Number of Inmates
Bridge City	\$587,455	\$9.14	\$671,404	\$10.57	174
Jetson	\$1,652,092	\$7.16	\$1,877,690	\$8.48	607
Swanson	\$1,541,080	\$9.96	\$1,807,048	\$13.13	377
Tallulah*	\$1,096,031	\$5.20	\$961,891	\$4.90	538
Jena*	0	0	\$300,316	\$6.09	235
Total	\$4,876,658	\$7.39	\$5,618,349	\$7.97	1,931
<p>Note: *These amounts are an allocation of the contract payments to these facilities by DOC. The allocation is based on cost data that were provided to us by Jena and Tallulah.</p> <p>Source: Prepared by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC.</p>					

DOC Contracted for Operation of Tallulah and Jena

DOC entered into cooperative endeavor agreements for the operation of Tallulah and Jena. Jena is managed on the basis of a cooperative endeavor agreement between DOC and the LaSalle Parish Hospital District No. 2 (Hospital District). Until September 21, 1999, Tallulah was managed under a cooperative endeavor agreement between DOC and the City of Tallulah. On that date, DOC assumed operation of the Tallulah facility. Despite the recent DOC takeover, certain provisions of the Tallulah cooperative endeavor agreement continue to impact department costs. (The City of Tallulah and the Hospital District are sometimes hereafter referred to as "contractors.")

By law, DOC may contract directly with a private company to manage a juvenile facility. However, the department entered into cooperative endeavor agreements with the two local governmental entities, which then contracted with two private companies to operate the facilities.

Changes to cooperative endeavor agreements may originate from either the state or the local entity. The cooperative endeavor agreements that establish and operate juvenile facilities achieve two basic purposes:

- Provide a means for the creation of new correctional facilities to house state juveniles
- Provide economic development for the towns in which these facilities are located

The original cooperative endeavor agreements between DOC and the contractors are for terms of 25 years or when no initial debt from the construction of the facilities remains outstanding, whichever is earlier.

The Hospital District assigned its right, title and interest in its contract with DOC to another party, and thereafter several additional assignments of the contract occurred. Ultimately Wackenhut Corrections Corporation (Wackenhut) became the assignee. According to an official with the Hospital District, Wackenhut built and owns the juvenile facility. This official stated that the Hospital District received no monetary payment for its role in the contracting process; it was simply trying to promote economic development.

Tallulah contracted with Trans-American Development Associates, Inc., (“Trans-American”) to manage the juvenile facility. This contract provides that Trans-American shall satisfy all of Tallulah’s obligations to the DOC under the DOC-Tallulah cooperative endeavor agreement. Pursuant to the Trans-American and Tallulah contract, Tallulah has received \$150,000 annually from Trans-American. An official of Tallulah stated that operation of the juvenile facility has strained the City’s facilities, especially its sewerage system. The \$150,000 payment helps Tallulah meet increased costs resulting from the facility’s operation.

**Contractors Must
Comply With
ACA Standards**

The Hospital District and the City of Tallulah must comply with American Correctional Association (ACA) standards. DOC's agreement with the Hospital District obligates it to operate and maintain Jena in accordance with ACA standards. The District is required to achieve ACA accreditation within twelve months and to maintain this accreditation throughout the life of the agreement. The City of Tallulah was also required to achieve ACA accreditation.

**DOC to Pay an
Annual Per Diem
Increase**

The original contracts required an annual per diem increase, based on the Consumer Price Index, of not more than 4 percent. The agreement between DOC and the Hospital District provided for an original per diem of \$59.25 per juvenile per day. The original agreement with the City of Tallulah provided for a per diem of \$48 during Phase I (the initial phase) of the facility's construction, to be raised to \$58 for all offenders when Phase II of the facility was completed and operational. The contractors were to be paid an annual per diem increase of not more than 4 percent, based on the Consumer Price Index.

Amendment Seven to the original contract with the City of Tallulah changed the per diem provisions by providing conditions under which the annual per diem increase could exceed 4 percent. Under this amendment, if the Consumer Price Index, during any 36-month period exceeds an average of 4 percent, DOC is required to adjust the per diem rate in the next time period based on the actual Consumer Price Index percentage. But this increase is not to exceed the average adjusted percentage increases in the appropriated budgets of equivalent state secure juvenile facilities.

**State Pays for
Charity Hospital
Care and Certain
Security Costs**

The state pays for juvenile health care at the charity hospitals. Most other health care is the responsibility of the contractor. The Hospital District's responsibility includes:

- All care provided within the facility
- All outside physician visits and other out-patient treatment, including dental and psychiatric
- All emergency room visits

- In-patient hospital costs for the first forty-eight hours

Under the terms of its contract with the Hospital District, DOC is responsible for all medically related security costs after the first forty-eight hours of hospitalization.

Local School Board Shared Education Expenses With Jena Contractor

Education expenses at Jena were shared by the facility operator and the local school board. On June 1, 1998, Wackenhut (the operator of the Jena facility) entered into an agreement with the LaSalle Parish School Board regarding offender education at the Jena facility. According to this agreement, Wackenhut supplied the school materials normally provided by a child's parents, supplied the books and equipment necessary to initially staff the facility library, and paid all expenses for summer school. The school board paid all expenses during the normal school year.

According to LaSalle Parish School Board officials, the school board spent \$974,000 in fiscal year 1998-99 providing educational services at Jena. The school board received additional MFP funding based on 189 students. However, school board officials informed us that they provided services to more than 250 offenders. Wackenhut paid the school board \$96,900 to provide the summer school program.

The Jena contract also requires the contractor to provide substance abuse services to its offenders. The contract does not address security or staff training responsibilities of the contractor.

DOC Still Obligated in the Event of Facility Takeover

DOC's financial obligations to the contractor continue despite facility operations by the DOC. The original Tallulah contract contained a provision that, in the event of DOC assuming operation of the facility, the department shall, subject to legislative appropriation, be required to pay the amounts necessary for payment of the principal, interest, and premium on the facility's outstanding debt. A later amendment to the contract made DOC responsible for the facility's property taxes and insurance coverage, in addition to repayment of principal and interest, in the event of a DOC takeover.

Amendment Eight to the Tallulah contract, yet again, changed provisions related to DOC costs in the event of the department assuming operation of the facility. This amendment repealed provisions relating to department payment of all the principal, interest and the other above-mentioned costs. Instead, DOC must pay a reduced per diem rate of \$16.62 for each of 686 juveniles. This amounts to almost \$4.2 million annually.

This per diem rate is subject to an annual increase of not more than 4 percent based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI). However, if the CPI, during any 36-month period, exceeds 4 percent, the rate of increase for the next time period could exceed 4 percent. There is no provision that the \$16.62 per diem will reduce or terminate when facility construction debt has been repaid. However, DOC is in negotiations with the contractor concerning contract provisions.

The contract between DOC and the Hospital District provides that DOC may assume operation of the Jena facility in the event of defects in the operation or maintenance of the facility that cannot be cured. In that event, DOC shall, subject to legislative appropriation, be required to pay the amounts necessary for payment of the principal, interest, and premium on the facility's outstanding debt.

**Factors That
Impact a
Facility's
Operating
Expenses**

An institution's incarceration costs are driven by the number of correctional officers needed to supervise offenders. Several factors influence this staffing level and the resultant costs. These factors include:

- Physical layout of the facility
- Custody category of the inmates
- A special program or function of a prison, such as a hospital or mental health unit
- The level of "career aging," or the number of years of state employment

The living arrangements of an institution's inmates (cells or dormitories) is largely determined by their custody level. Maximum-security inmates at a Level I facility will be housed in extended lockdown or in working cellblocks. A Level II institution

in Louisiana has fewer maximum-security inmates than a Level I facility. A Level III institution includes mostly minimum-security inmates, although it may have some cell blocks.

Exhibit 3-13 on the following page shows the custody level of each Louisiana prison and also shows the percentage of inmates living in cellblocks and dormitories at each facility. As Exhibit 3-13 shows, Level I institutions generally have a higher percentage of cellblocks than either Level II or Level III facilities. The percentage of cells at Wade, Angola, Hunt, and LCIW (the Level I facilities) ranges from 17 percent to 31 percent. In contrast, the percentage of cells at the six Level II facilities ranges from 2 percent to 19 percent. With the exception of WCI, all Level II facilities comprise 10 percent cells or less.

According to the Secretary of DOC, the density of cells at a correctional facility affects the ability of that facility to maintain security. Institutions with a large density of cells will require more correctional officers to secure an area, which increases incarceration costs.

That is emphasized by information we received from the Assistant Warden of Security at Allen Correctional Center. He told us that at his facility there are three correctional officers (CO) in a dorm housing unit during the day and four officers there at night. Yet in their cellblock housing unit of equal size, they have five correctional officers during the day and five officers at night.

Exhibit 3-13			
Percentage of Cells and Dormitories at Louisiana's Adult Correctional Facilities			
Custody Level	Facility	Percentage of Cells	Percentage of Dormitories
I	Wade Correctional Center	31	69
I	Louisiana State Penitentiary (Angola)	29	71
I	Elayn Hunt Correctional Center	18	82
I	L. C. I. W.	17	83
II	Washington Correctional Institute	19	81
II	Allen Correctional Center	10	90
II	Avoyelles Correctional Center	10	90
II	Winn Correctional Center	10	90
II	Dixon Correctional Institute	5	95
II	C. Paul Phelps Correctional Center	2	98
III	Work Training Facility-North	1	99

Source: Prepared by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC.

Physical Plant Layout Impacts Incarceration Costs

An institution's physical plant will affect its security staffing and expenditures. A physical plant layout that allows one CO to watch one hundred inmates will be less expensive than a layout that requires three COs to secure the same 100 inmates.

During our site visits to correctional facilities, several staff members emphasized to us the degree to which the physical plant layout impacts the numbers of staff needed to maintain security. The LCS Pine Prairie LLC operates a new local, non-DOC, facility. An official of this company told us, for example, that an important feature of this facility is a layout that makes much of its activity visible by as few staff as possible. According to Avoyelles staff, the physical plant layout at that facility is designed to enhance security with fewer correctional officers. One aspect of the physical plant is that each of the five housing units has a wagon wheel design. Each unit has a central pod/control room. From this center, eight spokes or hallways of dormitories or cellblocks protrude. This layout allows a CO to look into more than one hallway spoke from a stationary position. Accordingly, this housing layout requires fewer officers to maintain security. Allen and Winn have the same physical plant layout as Avoyelles.

In contrast, some dormitories at the Jetson Correctional Center for Youth have many potential hiding places, according to officials at that institution. Likewise, Bridge City is an old convent that was converted into a facility for male juvenile offenders. Such physical layouts require more correctional officers.

Economies of Scale Can Affect Administration Costs

Economies of scale can be a factor in the amount of administration expenses per inmate. Phelps and Work Training Facility-North have the smallest inmate populations of Louisiana's adult institutions. Since these are also among the most expensive facilities in per-inmate administration costs, a DOC official confirmed that economies of scale can be a factor in the amount of administration expenses per inmate. That is, certain administrative positions are necessary to operate a prison. Thus, the higher the number of inmates living at the facility, then the lower are certain administrative costs on a per inmate basis.

Recommendation

- 3.3 The DOC should collect and analyze all components of cost in order to make decisions on the most cost effective means of providing incarceration of state offenders.**

Chapter 4: Comparison of State (Privately and Publicly Operated) Adult Correctional Facilities

Chapter Conclusions

In fiscal year 1998-99, DOC spent an average of \$25.91 per inmate per day to operate Allen Correctional Center (Allen) and Avoyelles Correctional Center (Avoyelles). DOC spent an average of \$27.02 per day to operate Winn Correctional Center (Winn). However, including vocational-technical expenditures by the Louisiana Community and Technical College System, the average costs per day are \$26.08 for Allen, \$26.44 for Avoyelles, and \$27.02 for Winn. These numbers do not include capital costs such as depreciation and interest. Also, the expenditures presented for Avoyelles do not include any DOC headquarters' administrative costs. The expenditure figures for the two privately managed facilities (Winn and Allen) are based on contractual payments made by the DOC, plus some maintenance and repair costs incurred by the DOC for these two prisons.

In fiscal year 1998-99, the Louisiana Community and Technical College System spent approximately \$95,000 and \$300,000 at Allen and Avoyelles, respectively, to provide vocational-technical courses. When these expenditures are added to DOC's operational expenses, an average of \$26.08 per inmate per day was spent for Allen, \$26.44 for Avoyelles, and \$27.02 for Winn.

Allen and Winn have lower medical operating costs than Avoyelles. Avoyelles has more medical staff and provides more inmate medical contacts. Avoyelles also fills more prescriptions than the two private facilities. The inmate population at Avoyelles may need more medical services because of the selection of inmates housed in the facility.

Although the three institutions offer very similar social rehabilitation programs, Winn offers more vocational-technical courses and has a larger rehabilitation staff than the other two prisons. In fiscal year 1998-99, Allen and Winn spent more per inmate on rehabilitation than Avoyelles did.

The private prisons have much lower security costs than Avoyelles. Allen and Winn have smaller numbers of employees dedicated to security in the prisons. Winn and Allen also have a higher turnover of correctional officers than does Avoyelles.

Winn reported the highest expenditures for administration in fiscal year 1998-99. Allen reported the lowest. Winn allocates a percentage of its corporate overhead to administrative operating costs. It also accounts for depreciation, commissary purchases, and all employees' benefits in the Administration category. These factors help explain Winn's higher administration costs.

Avoyelles, Winn, and Allen are nearly identical in size, design, and the type and number of inmates. The state built and owns all three facilities. The state is responsible for heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) replacement. The two private companies are responsible, in general, for all other facility maintenance. In fiscal year 1998-99, DOC spent approximately \$39,000 and \$59,000 at Winn and Allen, respectively, for HVAC-related costs.

Allen and Winn are managed under contract by Wakenhut Corrections Corporation and the Corrections Corporation of America, respectively. These private companies are generally responsible for maintaining the facilities in terms of day-to-day operations and are paid a per diem. The contractual agreements between the state and these two companies provide for responsibilities regarding ACA standards, medical care, education, rehabilitation, and security. Also, the contracts stipulate that the State of Louisiana is to be held harmless from claims and liability resulting from acts or omissions to act of the contractors.

A Comparison of Medium Security Prisons

This chapter compares operating costs, staffing, services provided and other information for three correctional facilities:

- Allen Correctional Center (Allen)
- Avoyelles Correctional Center (Avoyelles)
- Winn Correctional Institute (Winn)

Two of these institutions, Allen and Winn, are privately managed by Wackenhut Corrections Corporation (WCC) and the

Corrections Corporation of America (CCA), respectively. DOC manages Avoyelles. The state paid for the construction of all of these facilities. These facilities were constructed at about the same time and are almost identical in their physical plant layout and the number of inmates housed. Allen and Winn are nine years old, and Avoyelles is 10 years old.

These three prisons are classified as Level II (medium security) facilities in terms of the type of inmate they house. In this chapter, we consider whether there are differences in health care, rehabilitation, and security among these publicly and privately managed correctional facilities. Because of time constraints in conducting this audit, we did not attempt to evaluate the quality of services being provided at these prisons. Appendix B contains a detailed comparison of the three prisons.

Exhibit 4-1 presents the overall operating expenditures, the average cost per inmate per day, the total number of inmates, and the total number of staff for Allen, Avoyelles, and Winn for fiscal year 1998-99.

Exhibit 4-1			
Expenditures, Inmate Population, and Staff Population			
Fiscal Year 1998-99			
	Allen Correctional Center	Avoyelles Correctional Center	Winn Correctional Center
DOC Operating Expenditures	\$14,355,401	\$14,544,967	\$14,900,903
Louisiana Community and Technical College Expenditures	\$95,242	\$299,744	\$0
Total Expenditures	\$14,450,643	\$14,844,711	\$14,900,903
Cost Per Inmate Per Day	\$26.08	\$26.44	\$27.02
Total Inmates	1,518	1,538	1,511
Total Staff	323	391	351
Note: In addition to contractual payments by DOC, total operating expenditures for Allen and Winn include maintenance and repair costs incurred by DOC for \$100,509 and \$176,030, respectively.			
Source: Developed by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC.			

**Allen Has the
Lowest Cost Per
Inmate Per Day**

Allen has the lowest expense per inmate per day of \$26.08 for fiscal year 1998-99. Expenditures for Avoyelles are \$26.44 per day, and the daily inmate cost for Winn (a privately managed facility) is \$27.02. Exhibit 4-1 reports total expenditures of \$14.5 million for Allen and \$14.8 million for Avoyelles. Winn has the highest total operating expenditures of \$14.9 million. Vocational-rehabilitation expenditures are included in these totals. All three institutions have relatively similar numbers of inmates, approximately 1,500.

The operating expenditures presented here for Avoyelles are only the direct costs of operating the facility (i.e., administration, incarceration, rehabilitation, and health). Expenditures include such items as correctional officer and staff salaries and benefits, supplies, maintenance, rent, utilities, travel, food services, professional services, and other miscellaneous charges. Other expenses not included are capital costs such as depreciation of the facility and any interest incurred on debt to finance the facility's construction. The DOC incurs administrative costs at its headquarters to manage the state facilities, but these costs are not allocated to the individual institutions. In addition, if the DOC sends an inspection team or other similar assistance to an adult prison, the costs of providing these services are not charged to the prison receiving the services, according to a DOC official. Finally, there are costs associated with services provided by other governmental entities, such as the Louisiana Community and Technical College System and the LSU Medical Center System.

The operating expenses presented for Allen and Winn are based on contractual payments made by the DOC and certain maintenance and repair costs incurred by the DOC. Contractual payments for Allen in fiscal year 1998-99 totaled over \$14 million and maintenance and repair costs incurred by the DOC reached \$100,509. The DOC paid close to \$15 million to Winn in the form of contractual payments and \$176,030 in maintenance/repair costs were incurred by the DOC for operations at Winn.

**Staffing Level
Higher at State
Facility**

The staffing level at the state run facility (Avoyelles) is higher than those of the two privately run facilities. As can be seen from Exhibit 4-1 on page 59, Allen and Winn, the two privately managed facilities, have fewer total staff than Avoyelles. Allen has 323 total staff, Winn has 351, and Avoyelles has 391. Avoyelles has 21 percent more staff than Allen and 11 percent more staff than Winn.

**Private Facilities
Have Lower
Medical Costs**

Allen and Winn have lower medical operating costs than Avoyelles. The medical costs for Avoyelles are 30 percent higher than Allen and 46 percent higher than Winn. As shown in Exhibit 4-2 below, Winn has an inmate per day cost of \$2.21 for providing medical services and Allen's cost is \$2.48. The cost for Avoyelles exceeds \$3.00 per day. One reason Avoyelles has a higher medical cost is that it has more medical staff. See Exhibit 4-3 on page 62. In addition, according to information provided by DOC, Avoyelles provides more patient contacts and fills more prescriptions, as is shown in Exhibit 4-4 on page 64.

Exhibit 4-2 Medical Expenditures Fiscal Year 1998-99			
	Allen Correctional Center	Avoyelles Correctional Center	Winn Correctional Center
Total Medical Costs	\$1,372,113	\$1,810,008	\$1,217,937
Average Cost per Day	\$2.48	\$3.22	\$2.21
<p>Note: Winn and Allen furnished their cost information. As these are private corporations, their methods of identifying and accounting for costs may not be comparable to the methods used by DOC.</p> <p>Source: Developed by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC, CCA, and Allen Correctional Center.</p>			

It must be noted that the medical, incarceration and rehabilitation costs for Winn and Allen were furnished, respectively, by Corrections Corporation of America (CCA) and Allen Correctional Center. These numbers represent what it costs Allen and Winn to furnish these three areas of service. Because of time constraints, we did not audit these numbers. We also did not attempt to ascertain how comparable these numbers are to the accounting methods used by DOC to capture and report its cost information for the state-operated prisons. Exhibits 4-2, 4-6, 4-8 and 4-10 use numbers furnished by Allen and CCA. The numbers furnished by CCA and Allen are different than the numbers portrayed in Exhibit 4-1 and other chapters of this report, which are based on DOC's contract payments to CCA or WCA. Except for certain exhibits of Chapter 4, when we provide numbers for Winn

or Allen, our numbers portray what DOC spends to operate these facilities, and not what it costs the private facilities themselves.

Avoyelles Has a Larger Medical Staff Than Private Facilities

Avoyelles has more full-time medical positions than the two private facilities. This publicly managed prison provides 32 percent more full-time medical staff than Allen and 56 percent more than Winn. In Exhibit 4-3, we compare the number of medical staff positions at the correctional facilities. One reason Avoyelles has more medical staff is that it has five Emergency Medical Technicians compared to one for Winn and none for Allen. Winn and Allen contract for outside pharmacy services whereas Avoyelles has a pharmacist in-house. There are also differences among the facilities not only in the number of nurses but also in the mix of Registered Nurses and Licensed Practical Nurses.

Exhibit 4-3 Medical Staffing September 1999			
	Allen Correctional Center	Avoyelles Correctional Center	Winn Correctional Center
Physicians	1	2	1
Optometrist	Once/month	Twice/month	Once/month
Registered Nurses	5	7	3
Licensed Practical Nurses	12	8	10
Pharmacists	1*	1	1*
Psychiatrists	1, once/week	1, twice/week	1, twice/month
Psychologists	10 hours/week	6.5 hours/week	4 times/week
Dentists	32 hours/week	1	1, twice/week
Dental Hygienists/Assistants	1	0	1
Oral Surgeons	once/week	22 hours/month	0
Radiologist	0	13 hours/month	0
Emergency Medical Technicians	0	5	1
X-Ray Technicians	3 times/week	16 hours/week	Once/week
Pharmacist Technicians	0	1	0
Total Full-Time Positions	19	25	16
Note: *Contracted			
Source: Developed by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC and individual correctional facilities.			

**Avoyelles Has
More Patient
Contacts Than
Do Private
Facilities**

Avoyelles, the publicly managed facility, has more medical contacts with inmates than do Winn or Allen. As Exhibit 4-4 on the following page shows, Avoyelles had a monthly average of almost 2,800 medical contacts with inmates. Allen was next with almost 2,100 contacts and Winn followed with more than 1,400. These contacts include visits with nurses, doctors, dentists, and other specialized medical services. In addition, this Exhibit includes mental health contacts. Avoyelles fills more prescriptions than Winn or Allen. We calculated the data in Exhibit 4-4 by taking a monthly average of the March 1999 to July 1999 data reported to the DOC by the individual correctional facilities.

Hunt Correctional Center's and Wade's reception and diagnostic centers decide where an inmate is placed. They consider such issues as an inmate's health, length of stay, and necessary level of security in order to make these placement decisions. According to a medical staff employee at Avoyelles, they have more sick patients than the private facilities do. One Avoyelles official stated that if an inmate in a private facility has to go to Huey P. Long Hospital and stays over 48 hours, he is placed at Avoyelles. (The DOC contractual agreements with CCA and WCA stipulate that the state shall be responsible for the cost of security after the first 48 hours of any inmate hospitalization.) In addition, this Avoyelles official reported that the high number of contacts and high number of prescriptions given is due to the quality of care provided. A medical staff member stated that the private facilities try to cut medical expenses to make a profit and the public facilities do not. An official at Winn stated that its low number of contacts and prescriptions resulted from no doctor or dentist on staff during the period of our data analysis (March through July 1999). It was searching for a doctor to fill the vacant position and the dentist was on an extended vacation. At the time of our visit in September 1999, Winn had a doctor on staff.

Exhibit 4-4			
Average Number of Monthly Inmate Medical Contacts			
March-July 1999			
	Allen Correctional Center	Avoyelles Correctional Center	Winn Correctional Center
Sick Call*	525	271	512
Doctor's Call**	663	1091	191
Dentist Visits: On Site	350	302	105
Regular Patient Contacts	1538	1664	808
Dentist Visits: Off Site	2	0.4	2
Optometry Visits: On Site	13	59	38
Optometry Visits: Off Site	7	14	2
Mental Health Contacts	298	652	292
Off-Site Emergency Care	10	15	3
Specialty Services: On Site***	111	102	191
Specialty Services: Off Site***	115	289	80
Total Monthly Patient Contacts	2,094	2,795	1,416
Number of New Prescriptions	569	1,455	402
Number of Refilled Prescriptions	1,048	1,741	345
Total Prescriptions	1,617	3,196	747
<p>Note: The data in this Exhibit were obtained by taking a monthly average of data for the period of March through July 1999.</p> <p>*Sick Call refers to the number of documented non-physician contacts by medical personnel including requests for emergency care and routine care and scheduled contacts. This does not include pill call.</p> <p>**Doctor's Call refers to the number of inmates/offenders seen by a physician. Nursing personnel may refer an inmate to a doctor once he's seen at sick call.</p> <p>***Specialty Services include orthopedics, cardiology, surgery, ear nose and throat, internal medicine, and gynecology on or off site.</p> <p>Source: Developed by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by the DOC and individual correctional facilities.</p>			

Winn Has More Rehabilitation Staff Than Allen or Avoyelles

Winn has more resources dedicated to rehabilitation programs than Avoyelles and Allen. Although Winn appears to dedicate more resources to its rehabilitation programs, the average cost per day per inmate is 42 percent less than Allen and only 19 percent more than Avoyelles (see Exhibit 4-6). According to a manager at Allen, its rehabilitation costs are higher than Winn and Avoyelles because of its contract with Parkview Baptist School to provide teachers. (This school provides the eight teachers shown in Exhibit 4-5.) Also, Allen includes another 23 positions under “rehabilitation” in its accounting system. The staff positions shown in Exhibit 4-5 include teachers in vocational-technical programs conducted by the Louisiana Community and Technical College.

Exhibit 4-5			
Correctional Facility Rehabilitation Staff			
September 1999			
	Allen Correctional Center	Avoyelles Correctional Center	Winn Correctional Center
Social Workers	2	5	2
Teachers	8	11	12**
Chaplains	1	4*	1
Other Rehabilitation Positions	12	12	19
Note: *1 full-time and 3 part-time chaplains. **Includes 1 part-time instructor.			
Source: Developed by Legislative Auditor’s staff from information provided by DOC and individual correctional facilities.			

Allen reported the highest expenditures for rehabilitation and Avoyelles the lowest of these three similar institutions. The rehabilitation operating costs are shown in Exhibit 4-6 on page 66. The following cost information includes expenditures by the Louisiana Community and Technical College System, which conducts courses at all adult prisons except Winn. The costs of these courses for fiscal year 1998-99 were as follows:

- Allen Correctional Center \$95,242
- Avoyelles Correctional Center \$299,744
- Winn Correctional Center \$0

More detailed information on rehabilitation expenditures is contained in Chapter 6. Rehabilitation includes expenditures for academic and vocational-technical courses, recreation, libraries, and religious activities. DOC and the Community and Technical College System expenditures do not include rehabilitation funds that may be provided by other state, federal, or private sources. These other sources include the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, the federal Job Training Partnership Act, the Louisiana Department of Social Services, the Louisiana Department of Health and Hospitals, and the Red Cross.

Exhibit 4-6			
Rehabilitation Expenditures			
Fiscal Year 1998-99			
	Allen Correctional Center	Avoyelles Correctional Center	Winn Correctional Center
Rehabilitation Costs	\$906,181	\$453,205	\$529,319
Average Cost Per Day	\$1.64	\$0.81	\$0.96
<p>Note: Winn and Allen furnished their cost information. As these are private corporations, their methods of identifying and accounting for costs may not be comparable to the method used by DOC.</p> <p>Rehabilitation expenditures include expenditures of the Louisiana Community and Technical College System to teach vocational-technical courses.</p> <p>Source: Developed by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC, CCA, Allen Correctional Center, and Louisiana Technical College System campuses.</p>			

As can be seen from Exhibit 4-7 on the following page, all three institutions offer similar, and the same number of, social programs to their inmates. Examples of these programs are Alcoholics Anonymous (AA), Substance Abuse, and Anger Management. However, the prisons differ in the vocational and technical programs they offer. Winn has the most vocational-technical opportunities, offering 10 of the 13 vocational-technical

programs we identified at these prisons. On the other hand, Allen offers four of the 13 programs, and Avoyelles offers six programs.

Exhibit 4-7						
Rehabilitation Programs Offered						
September 1999						
Courses	Allen Correctional Center		Avoyelles Correctional Center		Winn Correctional Center	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Social Programs						
Pre-Release	X		X		X	
Substance Abuse	X		X		X	
Character Counts	X		X		X	
Parenting Skills	X		X		X	
Sex Offender Program	X		X		X	
Anger Management	X		X		X	
Alcoholics Anonymous	X		X		X	
Narcotics Anonymous	X		X		X	
HIV Counseling	X		X		X	
Religious Services	X		X		X	
Total: Social Programs	10	0	10	0	10	0
Vocational-Technical Programs						
Culinary Arts	X		X		X	
Computerized Office	X			X	X	
Auto Body Repair		X	X		X	
Upholstery	X			X		X
Horticulture		X	X		X	
Data Entry		X		X	X	
Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning		X		X	X	
Printing		X		X	X	
Basic Automotive		X	X		X	
Cabinet Making	X			X		X
Janitorial and Sanitation		X		X	X	
Job Skills Education Program		X	X			X
Project Metamorphosis		X	X		X	
Total: Vocational-Technical Programs	4	9	6	7	10	3
Source: Developed by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by the DOC and individual correctional facilities.						

Private Prisons Have Much Lower Security Costs

Allen and Winn reported much lower incarceration expenditures than Avoyelles. In fiscal year 1998-99, DOC's expenditures for security at Avoyelles were 48 percent higher than Allen and 52 percent higher than Winn. Exhibit 4-8 below shows spending by each prison for the incarceration of inmates. The cost per inmate day for incarceration for the two private facilities is less than \$14. The cost is more than \$20 per day at Avoyelles.

Exhibit 4-8 Incarceration Expenditures Fiscal Year 1998-99			
	Allen	Avoyelles	Winn
Incarceration Expenditures	\$7,689,841	\$11,371,151	\$7,497,690
Average Cost Per Day	\$13.88	\$20.26	\$13.59
Total Number of Correctional Staff*	242	321	255
<p>Note: Winn and Allen furnished their cost information. As these are private corporations, their methods of identifying and accounting for costs may not be comparable to the method used by DOC.</p> <p>*The staff figures reported for Winn and Allen represent total incarceration staff. The figure for Avoyelles represents correctional security officers only.</p> <p>Source: Developed by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC, CCA, and Allen Correctional Center.</p>			

Private Facilities Have Fewer Correctional Officers

A major reason that privately managed facilities have lower incarceration costs is that there are fewer staff dedicated to security in the prisons. The security staffing levels are shown in Exhibit 4-8. The figure reported for Avoyelles represents correctional security officers only. The figures for Allen and Winn represent total incarceration staff. As seen in Exhibit 4-8, the number of correctional security officers at Avoyelles is larger than the total incarceration staff for Allen and Winn individually.

Privately managed correctional facilities also differ from public facilities in staff turnover. Exhibit 4-9 on page 69 indicates some security differences between publicly and privately managed facilities. Allen and Winn have a higher turnover of security officers than the DOC managed prison. Correctional officer turnover rates at all three institutions range from an annual low of 30 percent to a high of 70 percent. Even the lowest turnover rate may give rise to concern about the experience level of correctional officers in these facilities.

Exhibit 4-9			
Correctional Facility Security			
Fiscal Year 1998-99			
	Allen Correctional Center	Avoyelles Correctional Center	Winn Correctional Center
Number of Inmates	1,518	1,538	1, 511
Total Number of Incarceration Staff***	242	321	255
Inmate to Incarceration Staff Ratio	6.27	4.79	5.93
Annual Incarceration Staff Turnover Rate	70%	30%	38%
Monthly Inmate on Inmate Assaults*	15	26	10
Monthly Inmate on Staff Assaults*	3	1	3
Escapes**	2	1	1
Apprehensions**	2	1	1
<p>Notes: *Monthly average calculated from March 1999 to July 1999 data. **Total for March 1999 to July 1999. ***The staff figures reported for Winn and Allen represent total incarceration staff. The figure for Avoyelles represents correctional security officers only.</p> <p>Source: Developed by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC and correctional facilities.</p>			

Winn Has the Highest Administrative Costs

In fiscal year 1998-99, Winn reported the highest expenditures for administration and Allen the lowest of the three similar institutions. Winn's average cost per day is 172 percent higher than Avoyelles and 208 percent higher than Allen. The administration operating costs are shown in Exhibit 4-10 on page 70. According to the Vice President for Finance at CCA, Winn's administrative costs are higher, possibly because it includes:

- A percentage of CCA's corporate overhead
- All commissary purchases (about \$700,000 annually)
- All depreciation on equipment owned by Winn
- All employee benefits

The cost information furnished us for Allen and Avoyelles do not include corporate or DOC overhead costs, respectively, in the Administration category. In addition, these facilities did not include depreciation. Furthermore, Avoyelles and Allen have

salaries and employee benefits spread among all four cost categories, not just in the Administration category. Finally, Avoyelles does not account for commissary purchases in the Administration category.

Exhibit 4-10			
Administration Expenditures			
Fiscal Year 1998-99			
	Allen Correctional Center	Avoyelles Correctional Center	Winn Correctional Center
Administration Costs	\$1,056,175	\$1,210,347	\$3,244,405
Average Cost per Day	\$1.91	\$2.16	\$5.88
Note: Winn and Allen furnished their cost information. As these are private corporations, their methods of identifying and accounting for costs may not be comparable to the method used by DOC.			
Source: Developed by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC, CCA, and Allen Correctional Center.			

Physical Plant Characteristics Are Similar

Exhibit 4-11 below compares the physical plants of the three prisons. As can be seen in this exhibit, the physical plant characteristics of Winn, Allen, and Avoyelles are very similar. The construction cost of Avoyelles is higher than Allen or Winn because, of the three, it was constructed first and includes the original design fee.

Exhibit 4-11			
Physical Plant Information			
Fiscal Year 1998-99			
	Allen Correctional Center	Avoyelles Correctional Center	Winn Correctional Center
Age of Facility	9 Years	10 Years	9 Years
Cost of Facility	\$33,120,832	\$36,218,769	\$33,901,006
Number of Maintenance Staff	7	8	7
Inmate Capacity	1,538	1,538	1,538
Source: Developed by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC.			

**Building New
Prison Could
Provide Savings**

Building a new prison might yield cost savings to the state over the long term, if one of the more expensive prisons were replaced. DOC's average cost per day for each inmate at Avoyelles was \$25.91 in fiscal year 1998-99. This is somewhat cheaper than the average costs at other Level II facilities. For instance, DOC's average cost was \$35.22 per day at WCI, for a daily difference of \$9.31 compared to Avoyelles. To ascertain if building another prison with a design (and associated costs) like Avoyelles would be beneficial, we made some assumptions and computed potential savings.

The Legislative Fiscal Office Report to the Southern Legislative Conference contains projections of construction costs for new prisons. A new 1,500-bed prison in Louisiana was projected to cost \$43.1 million as of July 1999. We assumed that Louisiana could issue a 25-year general obligation bond at 6 percent interest to finance construction of a new facility and that this bond would be repaid in the 25th year. Interest costs for such a financing would total \$2,584,000 annually. The \$9.31 daily savings for 1,500 inmates would yield almost \$5.1 million in annual inmate cost savings. This would result in annual savings of \$2.5 million (\$5.1 million - \$2.6 million of interest cost). However, the \$43 million bond issue must be repaid in the 25th year (or ratably over 25 years).

The actual savings from these assumptions total \$19.8 million over 25 years, if the bonds are not repaid until the 25th year. Discounting the cash flows at 10 percent each year yields a net present value of \$18.8 million. These savings could occur whether the facility was managed by the state or a private company.

**Contractual
Arrangements
With Allen and
Winn**

Allen and Winn are managed under contract by Wackenhut Corrections Corporation (WCC) and the Corrections Corporation of America (CCA), respectively. Generally, the contracts give WCC and CCA the exclusive use, possession and control of the land and property comprising the facility and its grounds. This includes the use of movable equipment and perishables. Additional equipment may be placed in the facilities at the contractors' expense. The contractor is responsible for routine and preventive maintenance and will maintain a preventive maintenance program. In addition, WCC and CCA are responsible for making necessary repairs and replacement of equipment. However, the state is responsible for replacement of the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning

systems. Furthermore, all construction and renovation, which is requested by the contractor and approved by the state, will be at the expense of the contractor.

Contractors Must Comply With ACA Standards

Wackenhut and CCA must comply with American Correctional Association (ACA) standards. DOC's contracts with WCC and CCA obligate the contractors to operate and maintain the facilities under their management in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations and in keeping with ACA standards. They must comply with at least 90 percent of non-mandatory ACA standards and with all mandatory standards.

The contractors may not refuse to accept an inmate, but may request his transfer. The contractors may not refuse to accept any inmate assigned to the facility in accordance with the applicable DOC regulation (Regulation B-02-001). However, if the contractors believe the inmate has been erroneously assigned to the facility, or warrants transfer for medical, psychiatric, disciplinary, or administrative reasons, they may request DOC to transfer him.

DOC Is Required to Pay the Contractors a Per Diem

The contracts set an initial per diem with a 4 percent annual growth. The WCC contract and its amendments provided that WCC was to receive \$24.79 per inmate per day through June 30, 1997, for the first 1,282 inmates housed at Allen and \$18.44 for each additional inmate up to 1,474. Amendment No. 1 to the contract provided that once the number of inmates at Allen reached 1,455, a per diem of \$23.96 was to be paid for all inmates. The contract stipulates that on July 1, 1997, and on that date thereafter, the rate will increase by 4 percent. However, the rate increased by only 2 percent for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1999. The initial three-year contract was extended for an additional two years ending on December 4, 2000.

CCA received a per diem of \$24.82 per inmate from March 19, 1995, through June 30, 1996. Amendment No. 4 to the contract provides that commencing on January 19, 1999, the state shall pay a regular per diem rate of \$26.31 per inmate per day. It further stipulates that on July 1, 1999, and on that date each year thereafter, the rate will increase by 4 percent. However, the rate increased by only 2 percent for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1999.

The state is required to pay both contractors a minimum per diem equal to 95% of the facility's existing capacity, if the facility is able to house that many inmates. If the state decides to expand the inmate capacity at either facility, the per diem for the additional inmates will be negotiated by DOC and the contractor.

State Pays for Inmate Charity Hospital Care

Inmate health care provided at a state charity hospital is paid for by the state. The state is also responsible for the cost of security after the first 48 hours of any inmate hospitalization. A DOC official stated that DOC does not track costs incurred to provide security after 48 hours. In addition, he said that such inmates are often transferred into a DOC facility. Most other health care is the responsibility of the contractor. This contractor responsibility includes:

- All care provided within the facility
- All outside physician visits and other out-patient treatment, including dental and psychiatric
- All emergency room visits
- In-patient hospital costs for the first 48 hours

Contractor Must Provide Education Programs and Minimum Number of Security Positions

The contractor must provide education and rehabilitation programs. WCC and CCA are required by their contracts to provide inmate vocational and academic training in accordance with ACA standards. These include:

- Educational diagnostics and counseling
- General education high school equivalency
- Remedial and special education
- Pre-release dynamics
- Vocational education

The contracts require the contractors to provide inmates with pre-employment, substance abuse, and family/support network counseling. The Louisiana Technical College, Oakdale Campus provides two instructors for the upholstery and furniture making programs located at Allen. These two programs are part of Prison Enterprises.

Wackenhut is required to provide a minimum of 255 security positions at Allen. CCA must provide a minimum of 256 security positions at Winn. According to information furnished us by Allen, its average number of security staff during fiscal year 1998-99 was 242. This is 13 employees fewer what the DOC-Wackenhut contract required in 1995 (the capacity of Allen has increased since that date). Security vacancies are to be filled no later than 30 days after a vacancy occurs.

The contractors are required to subject applicants to a thorough background check. They are also to provide orientation and in-service training programs for all employees, in accordance with ACA standards and departmental regulations.

Contractors Are Required to Hold State Harmless

WCC and CCA are required to hold the state harmless for any claims resulting from acts of the contractors. The contracts require WCC and CCA to protect, defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the State of Louisiana, its departments, agencies, boards and commissions, officers, agents, servants, and employees from any claims, demands, expenses, and liability stemming from acts or omissions of the contractors or their employees.

Recommendations

- 4.1 The DOC should gather all costs associated with privately and publicly run facilities. In addition, the DOC should consider billing for its services in connection with privately run facilities. Contractual arrangements should include provisions for billing for DOC services to private contractors.**
- 4.2 The DOC should consider alternatives to high costs per day for incarceration. For example, it could consider building newer facilities that are more efficient and effective.**

Matter for Legislative Consideration

- 4.1 The legislature may wish to consider funding newer correctional facilities that are more cost efficient.**

Chapter 5: Housing of State Inmates in Local Facilities

Chapter Conclusions

Louisiana houses 14,000, or more than 40 percent of its adult state inmates in local facilities. This is due, in part, to the increasing state prison population. Expenditures for the Sheriffs' Housing of State Inmates program have reached \$137 million according to the fiscal year 2000-01 Executive Budget. The state pays a per diem of \$23 to sheriffs and local governing authorities for each state inmate housed in their local facilities.

Louisiana ranks very high in the number and percentage of state inmates housed in local facilities. In 1997, Louisiana had nearly one-third of all state inmates housed in local jails across the United States. In 1999, Louisiana ranked higher than 15 other southern states in the number of state inmates housed locally. National corrections officials told us that Louisiana's practice of housing state inmates in local jails for their entire sentences represents very much the exception. However, according to DOC Secretary Richard Stalder, President of the American Corrections Association, other states are outsourcing DOC inmates not only to local jails but also to other states.

The DOC's ability to incarcerate state inmates in local facilities is saving the state money. The \$23 per diem paid for housing state inmates at the local level is less expensive than the daily costs of the adult state facilities. However, the services provided in most local jails with such a per diem is not as extensive as those offered in state facilities.

For the most part, local sheriffs in Louisiana determine which state inmates will be sent to DOC facilities and which state inmates will be housed in their local jails. As a general rule, state inmates housed in local jails do not go through the Adult Reception and Diagnostic Centers at Hunt, LCIW, and Wade. These centers screen inmates for proper classification and placement. As a result, correctional staff may not be able to determine what services are necessary to effectively incarcerate and rehabilitate state inmates housed in local jails.

In addition, the number and variety of rehabilitation programs offered to state inmates in the local facilities are generally less extensive than those offered in the state facilities. As a result, DOC inmates housed in local jails may not be receiving services necessary for their rehabilitation and successful return to society.

The DOC exercises limited control over state inmates in local jails. The DOC monitors local jails through the Basic Jail Guidelines audit process and keeps track of which jails state inmates are housed in. However, the local jails have day-to-day custody and management of state inmates. Therefore, the DOC may not be fully aware if the necessary medical, mental health, rehabilitation, and security services for its state inmates are being delivered in the most effective manner.

The DOC uses the CAJUN II (Corrections and Justice Unified Network) system, maintained by Hunt's ARDC, to verify accurate inmate location and billing associated with the housing of state inmates in local jails. If billing errors are not detected through limited sampling, DOC has another procedure to check billings. However, this procedure may not ensure that the DOC is appropriately paying for inmates who are housed in local jails.

The fiscal year 1999-2000 Executive Budget presents incomplete performance data for the Sheriffs' Housing of State Inmates program. Also, there is no uniform cost reporting by the local facilities associated with the housing of state inmates. As a result, it is very difficult for legislative, department, and local officials to determine how the appropriated \$137 million is being used. In addition, it may be difficult to determine if the money is being spent effectively and efficiently.

Louisiana Houses Many State Inmates in Local Facilities

Louisiana houses more than 40 percent of its adult state inmates in local facilities in response to the overcrowding of state prisons. A report issued by the Legislative Fiscal Office in 1999 states that there are a total of approximately 33,350 state inmates in Louisiana. Publicly and privately managed state prisons house 19,303 of these inmates. The remaining 14,047 (42.1 percent) are housed in more than 100 local, or parish, facilities.

According to the 1999-2000 and 2000-01 executive budgets, actual expenditures and expenditure requests for the sheriffs' housing of state inmates are as follows:

- Fiscal year 1997-98: \$91 million
- Fiscal year 1998-99: \$114 million
- Fiscal year 1999-00: \$137 million (current operating budget)
- Fiscal year 2000-01: \$161 million (total request)

These figures include expenditures for both adult inmates and juvenile offenders.

Louisiana Revised Statute (R.S.) 15:824 (A) states that any individual subject to confinement in a state adult penal or correctional institution shall be committed to the DOC. This statute further provides that the director of the DOC shall assign each newly committed inmate to an appropriate penal or correctional facility. In addition, R.S. 15:824 (B) gives the DOC the authority to house inmates in local facilities and to pay a per diem to the sheriff or parish governing authority for each state inmate housed. State inmates may be housed in local facilities for such reasons as lack of facilities under the control of the DOC, or if the inmate is held without bail, pending an appeal of his sentence.

Currently, the per diem paid to sheriffs or parish governing authorities for the housing of state inmates in local facilities is \$23. Per diem payments are appropriated from the state general fund. The DOC also reimburses local jails for some of the costs associated with the extraordinary medical expenses incurred in emergency circumstances when the health of the inmate requires the use of the closest services available (instead of an LSU Medical Center facility). The budgeted amount for this reimbursement is \$100,000. In addition, Orleans Parish Prison receives additional medical and mental health payments for juveniles and adults. According to the 1999-2000 Executive Budget, Orleans Parish is reimbursed an additional per diem of \$2 for medical expenses for inmates and \$7 for all inmates served by their mental health unit.

According to a DOC official, state inmates with sentences of 20 years or more will typically serve their sentences in state facilities. Longer sentences are usually associated with crimes that are of a more brutal nature; thus, these types of inmates are sent to the state facilities. However, he stated that this does not necessarily mean that you would not find an inmate serving a life sentence in a local facility. A state inmate may be confined in a local jail to serve out his entire sentence. Whether an inmate is

kept at a local facility or sent to a state facility is basically up to the sheriff. R.S. 15:824(B)(3) requires the DOC to take from local custody, upon request by the sheriff, any inmate deemed dangerous, an escape risk, or physically or mentally ill.

Louisiana Accounted for One-Third of State Inmates in Local Jails

In 1997, Louisiana accounted for almost one-third of state inmates held in local jails throughout the United States. According to data from the U.S. Department of Justice, 31 states housed a total of 33,736 state inmates in local jails in 1997. Yet of these 31 states, Louisiana accounted for almost one-third of the state inmates held in local jails anywhere in the country. Louisiana had nearly 11,000 state inmates housed in local jails in 1997.

Nationally, 3 percent of state inmates were housed in local jails in 1997. In the same year, 36.9 percent of all Louisiana state inmates were housed in local jails. Only six other states (West Virginia, Colorado, Arkansas, Virginia, New Mexico, and New Jersey) had more than 10 percent of their state inmates in local jails. Eight of the 31 states housing state inmates in local jails had less than one percent of their state inmates in local jails.

According to data from the U.S. Department of Justice, Louisiana housed 10,795 state inmates in local jails at year-end 1997. At year-end 1998, Louisiana housed 13,211 state inmates in local jails, a 22 percent increase.

Louisiana exceeded 15 other Southern states in both the number and percentage of adult state inmates housed in local jails. According to figures presented in a Legislative Fiscal Office report to the Fiscal Affairs and Government Operations Committee (a SLC committee), Louisiana housed 14,047 state inmates in local facilities as of July 1, 1999. See Exhibit 5-1 on page 79. Louisiana ranked first out of 15 other southern states. In addition, almost 48 percent of Louisiana's total local jail population was comprised of state inmates.

Exhibit 5-1				
State Inmates Housed in State and Local Jails				
1999				
State	Inmates in State Facilities	Inmates in Local Jails	Total State Inmates	Percent of State Inmates in Local Jails
Alabama	22,593	1,618	24,211	6.7%
Arkansas	10,699	343	11,042	3.1%
Florida	68,282	34	68,316	0.1%
Georgia	41,665	2,647	44,312	6.0%
Kentucky	11,849	3,252	15,101	21.5%
Louisiana	19,303	14,047	33,350	42.1%
Maryland	21,670	0	21,670	0.0%
Mississippi	9,724	1,866	11,590	16.1%
Missouri	25,385	0	25,385	0.0%
North Carolina	31,593	47	31,640	0.2%
Oklahoma	21,480	473	21,953	2.2%
South Carolina	21,172	400	21,572	1.9%
Tennessee	16,342	5,710	22,052	25.9%
Texas	148,964	0	148,964	0.0%
Virginia	31,178	4,241	35,419	12.0%
West Virginia	3,004	606	3,610	16.8%
Total	504,903	35,284	540,187	6.5%
<p>Source: Developed by Legislative Auditor's staff from information contained in 1999 Adult Correctional Systems report of the Louisiana Legislative Fiscal Office.</p>				

These differences in the numbers of state inmates housed in local jails tell only part of the story. An official from the National Institute of Corrections told us that Louisiana's practice of housing state inmates in local jails for their entire sentences represents very much the exception. However, according to DOC Secretary Richard Stalder, President of the American Corrections Association, other states are outsourcing DOC inmates not only to local jails but also to other states.

Use of Local Jails Is Cheaper

Sheriffs are paid a per diem of \$23 for each state inmate housed in their local facilities. This is less expensive than the daily operating costs of the adult state facilities (see Chapter 3 for adult facility daily costs). Therefore, DOC's

ability to incarcerate state inmates in local facilities is saving the state money.

For example, DOC's fiscal year 1998-99 daily operational expenditures for keeping an offender at Avoyelles Correctional Center were \$25.91 per inmate. Avoyelles is a publicly operated adult state facility. The difference between the local per diem and the daily operational cost at Avoyelles is a savings of \$2.91. With approximately 14,047 inmates being housed at the local level, the state is saving at least \$15 million a year in prison operating costs, not including construction costs to build additional prisons. According to an official at the National Institute of Corrections, the \$23 per diem is cheap. However, the services provided in most local jails with such a per diem are not as extensive as those offered in state facilities.

Local Sheriffs Determine Where Inmates Are Housed

According to officials at the DOC, after sentencing of a state inmate, the sheriff either accepts the inmate into his local jail or sends him to the DOC. The DOC keeps only those inmates convicted of a felony. The local sheriff determines if an inmate, after being convicted of a felony, will stay at the local level or go to a state institution. More specifically, a sheriff will typically keep those inmates who are not costly to incarcerate or those who offer a particular skill. There are no written contracts for the majority of local facilities that house state inmates, although the DOC has entered into over 20 cooperative endeavor agreements with local facilities housing state inmates.

According to a DOC official, the sheriffs send to the DOC inmates who have longer sentences and medical, mental, or behavioral problems. State inmates can be transferred from state facilities to local jails. Furthermore, sheriffs can transfer state inmates from one local jail to another. Although the DOC maintains ultimate custody of these inmates, a state inmate may serve his entire sentence in a local facility.

The DOC has entered into over 20 cooperative endeavor agreements with local law enforcement districts. These districts are units of local government, which may enter into partnerships with the DOC to provide housing for state inmates. A typical cooperative endeavor agreement provides that a district, municipal or parish governing authority agrees to construct and/or operate a jail facility. The DOC agrees to house a minimum amount of state inmates in the facility at a set per diem rate.

We reviewed two cooperative endeavor agreements. These agreements did not mandate what rehabilitation services are to be provided and who is to pay for them. One agreement contained a hold harmless provision. This provision protects the state against liability growing out of any act or omission of the district.

According to a DOC official, cooperative endeavor agreements are the only written contracts that exist between the DOC and local jails concerning the housing of state inmates in local jails. However, most of the local facilities housing state inmates do not have any type of written contract with the DOC. This official stated that a sheriff who wants to start housing state inmates will notify surrounding parishes and Hunt that he desires to start receiving inmates. This official further stated that the sheriff must initiate the Basic Jail Guidelines process to obtain certification once he begins to house state inmates.

Recommendations

- 5.1 The DOC should consider establishing a contract process with those local correctional facilities housing state inmates. The contract between the DOC and such local facilities should stipulate what services are to be provided by the jails and who will pay for them.**
- 5.2 The DOC should have, in the contract, a provision which holds the state, DOC, its officers, agents, and employees harmless from claims and liability arising out of injury, death, property damage, et cetera, that are the result of an act or omission to act of the district or local correctional facility. This provision should stipulate that the law enforcement district or local correctional facility will repay the DOC if the DOC is held liable for an act or omission of the district or local correctional facility. The agreement should also provide that the local district and/or facility will pay for the attorney fees, if found at fault.**

State Inmates May Receive Inadequate Screening Services

State inmates in local jails may not be receiving adequate services or services comparable to those in the state correctional facilities. According to information we obtained from personnel at Hunt Correctional Center's Adult Reception and Diagnostic Center (ARDC), thousands of state inmates housed in

local jails do not go through the diagnostic and classification screening process at Hunt. Therefore, these inmates may not be receiving proper screening. This could result in their not receiving necessary services because these inmates may not reach facilities that are more equipped to handle their special incarceration, rehabilitative, medical, or mental health needs.

A DOC official stated that DOC processes 6,000 to 12,000 inmates per year. He informed us that every inmate goes through ARDC. R.S. 15:828(A)(1) states that the secretary of the DOC shall establish programs of classification and diagnosis for persons committed to and in the physical custody of the DOC. According to the statute, this classification and diagnosis is intended to assist in the rehabilitation of state inmates and their return to the community. However, state inmates kept at the local level do not go through DOC's ARDC. In addition, those inmates that are transferred from local jail to local jail do not go through DOC's ARDC.

In addition, LCIW and Wade each have a reception center performing functions similar to Hunt Correctional Center's ARDC. ARDC personnel screen inmates by considering factors such as their crime, sentence, educational background, substance abuse history, medical and mental condition, and whether they need protection from other inmates. Once classification is completed, the inmate is transferred to a DOC facility. Although Hunt, LCIW, and Wade do not screen the state inmates housed at local facilities, the local jails have their own screening processes. However, personnel at ARDC were unable to comment on the screening standards employed by the local facilities.

The ARDC process is mandated by detailed DOC policy and is quite extensive. The DOC's expenditures for Hunt's ARDC in fiscal year 1998-99 were almost \$3.4 million. Even if all state inmates in local jails receive diagnostic and classification services equal to those at Hunt's ARDC, the fact that DOC does not control this process is a legitimate basis for concern. The DOC should be knowledgeable of the services needed and being received by state inmates.

A former court appointed expert for corrections informed us that state inmates in local jails generally receive inadequate screening and, consequently, inadequate rehabilitative and security services.

Recommendations

- 5.3 The DOC should establish regulations mandating a screening process of state inmates in local jails reflective of processes at ARDC. Local jails should also report this classification information to ARDC. This would allow the DOC to pinpoint problem inmates and to make more adequate placement decisions.**
- 5.4 The DOC may want to study the feasibility of processing all state inmates at DOC's ARDC facilities.**

Local Facilities' Rehabilitation Less Extensive

The rehabilitative services at local facilities are not as extensive as those offered at the state prisons. According to a DOC official, the levels of rehabilitation programs offered at local facilities vary. We visited five local facilities and found that, generally, the number and variety of rehabilitation programs are less than those offered at state facilities. (Chapter 6 has information regarding the rehabilitative programs offered at the state prisons.) Also, some local facilities report no spending for rehabilitation. As a result, state inmates placed in local facilities may not be receiving the services necessary to return them to society as more educated, skilled, and productive citizens.

R.S. 15:828 (A)(1) provides that the DOC shall direct efforts toward the rehabilitation of persons committed to and in the physical custody of the department to return them to the community as promptly as practicable. Also, R.S. 15:828 (B) states that the secretary shall prescribe rules and regulations in the facilities and institutions under the jurisdiction of the DOC to encourage voluntary participation by inmates in vocational training, adult education, literacy, and reading programs. There do not appear to be such statutory mandates for rehabilitation at local jails.

At some of the five local facilities we visited, rehabilitative services are not as extensive as those offered in state facilities. We visited the following five local facilities:

- East Baton Rouge Parish Prison (EBRPP)
- Avoyelles Bordelonville Correctional Center (ABCC)
- Riverbend Detention Center (Riverbend)

- South Louisiana Correctional Center (SLCC)
- Orleans Parish Prison (OPP)

EBRPP offers limited rehabilitation programs. A parish official stated that they do not provide much rehabilitation at EBRPP. This is apparently due to a lack of money and resources. However, they do have a GED (General Equivalency Diploma) program, AA (Alcoholics Anonymous) program, religious programs, and a drug wing. According to an employee at the prison, the city/parish reimburses the East Baton Rouge Parish School Board for the GED program. The sheriff pays four ministers for the religious programs and volunteers are used for the religious programs and AA. The Nineteenth Judicial District runs the drug wing and the staff is funded through the Judicial Expense Fund. At the time of our visit, EBRPP housed over 1,400 inmates with a total of 82 DOC inmates.

ABCC houses only female DOC inmates and offers limited rehabilitation programs. According to information obtained from ABCC officials, this facility offers very few rehabilitative services. They have one GED class, two AA groups, and religious services. There are no vocational-education programs, but trustees can participate in a work-release program. The sheriff's department pays the principal of a local school (as a deputy) to teach the GED class. Volunteers run AA groups and religious programs. At the time of our visit, ABCC housed 192 DOC inmates.

Riverbend also houses only DOC inmates and offers limited rehabilitation programs. An employee at Riverbend informed us that the prison offers limited rehabilitative programs. These programs include GED, AA, and NA (Narcotics Anonymous). A certified instructor teaches the GED classes and is paid a salary by Riverbend. The warden informed us that the GED instructor helps volunteers run the AA and NA programs. Riverbend's census is about 200 DOC inmates.

Rehabilitative services offered at SLCC are more extensive than those offered at EBRPP, ABCC, and Riverbend. SLCC offers programs in substance abuse, after care, cognitive self-change, anger management, HIV peer education, parenting, and religious services. In addition, the prison offers an adult literacy program, learn to read program, adult basic education program (ABE), GED program, and an art class. SLCC also offers a work-release program and vocational welding school. This

facility has the RISE inmate group (Resurrecting Individuals, Societies, and Environments) which includes a pre-release function. Furthermore, SLCC has a Toastmasters group. An employee stated that all rehabilitation programs are funded through the per diem paid to them for housing state inmates. However, SLCC receives grant money from the U.S. Department of Labor's JTPA program for its vocational welding school. Also, the facility uses volunteers for religious services and parenting classes. At the time of our visit, SLCC housed 838 DOC inmates.

Rehabilitative services offered at OPP are more extensive than those offered at EBRPP, ABCC, and Riverbend. An Orleans Parish Prison official informed us that OPP has the About Face program, which is a boot camp program for about 700 inmates. This official stated that OPP also has a GED program, and a variety of vocational-technical programs that include culinary, auto body repair, auto mechanics, plumbing, carpentry, gardening and welding. In addition, an official informed us that OPP offers programs in prison art, crafts, and community service and has a work-release program. According to the sheriff, the only non-OPP money that the prison receives to operate these programs is \$2,739 for the About Face boot camp program. This money is provided by the Department of Health and Hospitals. Also, OPP has volunteers for the About Face program, AA, NA, and a variety of religious programs. At the time of our visit, the OPP housed approximately 7,000 inmates, of whom approximately 2,700 were DOC inmates.

Although we visited only five local facilities, several sources state that the level of rehabilitative services in most local facilities are not as extensive as those offered at state prisons. For example, OPB officials feel that inmates in local jails do not get the same educational, health, and mental health services as those in the state prisons do. Furthermore, in a 1996 report commissioned by the Louisiana Sheriffs' Association (LSA) titled "The Cost of Confining Prisoners in Louisiana," the author (Dr. Michael Kurth of McNeese State University) offers the following: "Compared to prisons, jails generally are quite Spartan, offering little in the way of counseling, recreation or rehabilitation programs for their inmates." He further explains that it is cheaper to house an inmate in a local jail rather than a state prison. This is due, in part, to the fact that jails generally provide fewer programs and amenities for their inmates.

Lastly, we sent letters to local sheriffs and facilities housing state inmates that asked for cost information about operating their jails. Of the 20 responses, six jails showed small rehabilitation expenditures and seven showed no rehabilitation expenditures. Five of the responding jails presented information in their financial statements that made it impossible to determine rehabilitation expenditures. Financial reporting is discussed later in this chapter.

DOC's Oversight of State Inmates in Local Facilities

The DOC exercises limited oversight over its state inmates housed in local facilities. According to R.S. 15:824(A), any convicted felon shall be committed to the DOC. R.S. 15:824 (B) further provides that if the DOC does not confine the felon, then the department will pay a per diem amount to the sheriff or other governing authority that houses the felon in their jail. The DOC's per diem payment is for keeping and feeding the inmates. It appears that state inmates housed in local jails are still the responsibility of the DOC. A DOC official stated that this responsibility can be delegated to local jails because of the \$23 per diem. The limited control exercised by DOC could result in state inmates not receiving necessary medical, mental health, rehabilitation, and security services. More specifically, the DOC may not be able to determine what types of treatment inmates need and what they are receiving.

Although there seems to be a desire on the part of the DOC to transfer responsibility to the local jails, DOC employs some control and accountability processes. Local jails that house state inmates must comply with the Basic Jail Guidelines. There are approximately 72 guidelines. These local jail standards include guidelines for administration, physical plant, institutional operations, institutional services, and inmate programs. The formulation of these guidelines was a collaborative effort of the DOC, the Louisiana Sheriffs' Association (LSA), and then Governor Edwin Edwards.

A monitoring team inspects local jails to determine compliance with the guidelines. The team consists of DOC and LSA representatives. A Jail Operations Committee is responsible for review of the monitoring process and resolution of monitoring issues. Those participants who comply with the guidelines are issued certificates. If a local jail is found to be noncompliant, it is given 120 days to prepare a corrective plan of action. If no plan is formulated or no action taken, the DOC may then remove state inmates from the jail. After the initial inspection, subsequent

compliance inspections will be conducted every three years. In addition, local jails are to submit annual statements to the committee confirming continued compliance. According to a DOC official, this monitoring process is the only administrative service that DOC provides to local correctional facilities. The official stated that these monitoring functions are the job responsibilities of certain DOC employees and the costs for such functions are not separated from other costs.

Adherence to the guidelines and the related “audit-like” and reporting processes give the DOC some degree of control. However, the degree to which the guidelines measure a local jail’s ability to house state inmates must be considered. For example, there are only seven guidelines dealing with rehabilitation programs. Furthermore, these guidelines do not extensively address the establishment of educational programs. Guideline V-001 states that written policy, procedure, and practice provide for educational programming from acceptable internal or external sources which should include, at a minimum, assistance in obtaining individualized program instruction at a variety of levels. Unlike the more stringent ACA standards, which have over 20 pages of standards dealing with social, academic, and vocational services, the Basic Jail Guidelines may not mandate the creation of a penal environment conducive to the most effective incarceration of an inmate.

Finally, local facilities housing state inmates may not be providing necessary security services. According to an October 17, 1999, article published in Baton Rouge’s Advocate, the DOC lists 50 prisoners as escaped and not captured. This list reaches back to 1935 and its most recent date of escape is August 16, 1999. However, nearly half of the escapes occurred before 1981. Of the 50 fugitives listed in the article, most of the recent escapees fled from parish-run jails. Of the last 12 escapes (from 1993 to 1999), at least nine were from local facilities. If local facilities are not providing security services that are reflective of those offered in state prisons, the DOC and surrounding communities may continue to be faced with such escapes and safety issues.

As mentioned before, we contacted one of Louisiana’s former court appointed experts for corrections. According to this former expert, it would be a difficult task for the DOC to manage state inmates in both the state prisons and local facilities.

Inmate Location and Billing Verification

The DOC uses the CAJUN II system, maintained by Hunt's ARDC, to verify accurate inmate location and billing associated with the housing of state inmates in local jails. The CAJUN II (Corrections and Justice Unified Network) system is a database that is maintained by Hunt's ARDC. CAJUN II contains general inmate information, including the physical location and transfer history of inmates in state prisons and local jails. According to ARDC staff, local sheriffs send individual inmate pre-class packets to ARDC to inform them that they are housing a DOC inmate. Staff enters this information into the CAJUN II system. When a DOC inmate is transferred from one local jail to another local jail, it is the responsibility of the sender and the receiver to notify ARDC so updates can be made in the CAJUN II database. ARDC staff stated that if no notification is received, they basically are not aware of inmate movement and transfers. As a result, the accuracy of the CAJUN II records will, for the most part, be determined by the notification processes of the sheriffs and local facilities housing state inmates.

According to DOC accounting staff, sheriffs and local facilities send invoices to the DOC to be paid for their housing of state inmates. DOC samples 10 percent from each invoice and checks these inmate names through the CAJUN II system for verification purposes. By retrieving inmate records from CAJUN II and comparing them to the sheriffs' invoices, DOC can determine if the inmates listed on the sheriffs' rosters are state inmates. Also, they can identify inmates listed on the sheriffs' invoices that are not yet the financial responsibility of the DOC (e.g., parole violator not yet revoked by parole board). However, if errors occur in the 90 percent portion of the invoices not regularly checked by DOC, they may be missed and not detected. In addition, if records kept in the CAJUN II system are not accurate and complete, DOC may have a difficult time determining where the state inmates are acutally housed.

According to a DOC official, DOC performs a verification each month to compare the weekly inmate census reports generated through Hunt Correctional Center to the number of inmates invoiced monthly by each local facility. He stated that this verification process provides additional assurances that the facilities are invoicing for the appropriate inmates. Although this serves as an additional check, this procedure may not ensure that the DOC is appropriately paying for inmates who are housed in local jails. More specifically, the census list used for verification purposes is a compilation of reports by the sheriffs and facilities

housing state inmates and this is then matched against invoices from the same sources. Thus, except for the sampling procedure, there is not an independent source used to verify the invoices.

We checked 176 inmate names, from two jail rosters, through the CAJUN II system and found 14 (8%) potential problems. More specifically, we identified eight CAJUN records that contradicted the physical location of the inmates listed on the jail rosters. Also, we found no records in CAJUN for six inmate names. ARDC staff explained that sheriffs and local jails are supposed to notify them when inmates are transferred. However, this does not always happen. As a result, there are discrepancies between invoices, or jail rosters, and CAJUN records. In addition, no records may exist for some DOC inmates because of delays in processing. Also, an official at Hunt stated that sheriffs may submit names to the DOC of inmates who are not yet the financial responsibility of the DOC (e.g., parole violators), but this is not supposed to occur.

Whatever the reasons, if inaccurate or incomplete records are kept in the CAJUN system, it will be difficult for the DOC to verify the location of state inmates in local jails and, ultimately, for accounting to verify the invoices sent in by sheriffs and local facilities. Furthermore, if the 10 percent sample conducted by DOC does not catch errors in the sheriffs' invoices, billing errors may go undetected.

Recommendation

- 5.5 The DOC should evaluate the CAJUN II system for accurate and complete records. To do this, the department may want to consider the reporting and recording processes that occur between ARDC and those local facilities housing state inmates. Also, DOC should evaluate the effectiveness of its 10 percent sampling verification method and census verification method to identify billing errors.**

Incomplete Performance Data Presented in the Executive Budget

The fiscal year 1999-2000 Executive Budget reported incomplete performance data for the Sheriffs' Housing of State Inmates program. The Sheriffs' Housing of State Inmates program has budgeted expenditures of \$137 million for fiscal year 1999-2000. This is an increase of more than \$20 million from

actual expenditures in fiscal year 1998-99. Although this program is appropriated such a large amount of money from the state general fund, there are no comprehensive performance data which reflect the services the state is receiving for its money.

The Executive Budget contains one mission, one objective, and seven performance indicators for this program. There are no goals listed in the budget. Without the presentation of complete performance data, it is difficult for the legislature to determine what types of services state inmates are receiving in local jails.

The mission presented in the budget has no accompanying goals. Without goals, it is difficult to determine how one would approach and achieve the overall mission. In addition, the one objective presented is broad. Objectives should be measurable, and this one is not. Finally, there are no outcome performance indicators presented. That is, most of the indicators presented are outputs. As a result, no performance indicators are presented which might give policy makers an idea of the programs offered to state inmates and their success rate. Without complete performance data, it is difficult for legislators to determine specifically what is being accomplished by expenditures for local housing. A former court appointed expert for corrections encouraged the establishment and reporting of specific and meaningful performance data by the local sheriffs housing state inmates.

In a 1997 report from the Legislative Auditor's Office, "Department of Public Safety and Corrections, Corrections Services: Analysis of Program Authority and Performance Data," we concluded that the 1996-97 Executive Budget presented no comprehensive performance data for the Sheriffs' Housing of State Inmates program. In addition, this report explained that without complete performance data for programs and activities, the legislature may be unable to make informed budgetary decisions related to them. We recommended that the DOC and OPB staffs work with the House Appropriations Committee staff to develop additional performance data for this program. By developing comprehensive performance data and reporting it to the legislature, the legislature would be able to make more informed budgeting decisions about this program. After reviewing the program's performance data presented in the 1999-2000 Executive Budget, it appears that the DOC did not act on this recommendation.

Recommendation

5.6 The DOC, LSA, and sheriffs of local jails may want to cooperate with OPB to establish complete performance data for the Sheriffs' Housing of State Inmates program. By including complete performance data (i.e., mission, goals, objectives, and a mix of performance indicators), the legislature may be able to more easily determine what is being achieved with the \$137 million spent on this program.

Cost Information Not Reported for State Inmates

Local facilities generally do not track and report expenses related to DOC inmates. It follows that they cannot break out administration, incarceration, rehabilitation, and health costs for state inmates like DOC can for state prisons. As a result, it is difficult for the legislature to determine exactly how much of the \$137 million it appropriates to the Sheriffs' Housing of State Inmates program is actually spent on DOC inmates. The total expenditures reported in the 1999-2000 Executive Budget for the DOC reached \$573 million. The expenditures reported for the Sheriffs' Housing of State Inmates program accounts for 24 percent of the total expenditures.

For several reasons, we sent out cost templates to 97 sheriffs and local facilities that house DOC inmates. First, we wanted to capture cost information and determine how much it actually costs to house a state inmate in a local facility. Also, we wanted to determine if local jails had cost information readily available. Finally, we wanted to see how much money local jails were spending on rehabilitation programs for state inmates. Of the 97 letters we mailed, only six sheriffs and 14 other local facilities responded to our cost template requests (see Appendix C for the list of those who received cost templates and those who responded). An official of the Louisiana Sheriffs' Association stated that local sheriffs would have difficulty responding to our cost templates because they do not track and report costs like state facilities (i.e., administration, incarceration, rehabilitation, health). Sheriffs generally have law enforcement, tax collection, and other functions besides operation of the jail. The local jail is typically not set up as a separate entity for accounting purposes. Also, for some jails, another local governmental body (e.g., police jury) contributes to jail costs, in addition to the sheriff.

After reviewing and analyzing the 20 cost templates we received, we concluded that the reported daily costs per inmate ranged from a low of \$13.68 at West Carroll Detention Center to a high of \$198 at Eunice. Most local facilities were in the range of \$20 to \$35. For example, daily costs reported for Riverbend were \$21.74 per inmate in fiscal year 1997-98 and \$20.04 in fiscal year 1998-99. We could not calculate the costs for four of the 20 jails because of insufficient information. The reliability of these numbers is suspect because most cost information we received was not audited.

In addition, six jails presented small expenditure amounts related to rehabilitation programs. Seven local facilities presented no costs related to rehabilitation expenditures. Furthermore, we could not determine rehabilitative expenditures for five of the jails because of the presentation of cost data in the financial statements. We received two responses from local facilities that contained minimal or no cost information because these facilities house few DOC inmates.

If sheriffs and local jails are unable to report cost information for DOC inmates in a detailed manner, it is very difficult for policy makers and department officials to determine what the state and DOC are receiving for the per diem payments. If the local jails cannot break out costs and report them to DOC, it is difficult for legislative, department, and local officials to determine if the current per diem is an overestimated or underestimated figure. If the DOC is responsible for these inmates, it needs to establish and maintain a more effective managerial oversight. To do this, the DOC needs management tools including accurate cost data and performance data. The former federal court appointed expert for corrections encouraged the tracking and reporting of cost information by the local jails.

Recommendation

- 5.7 The legislature, DOC, and LSA may want to consider establishing uniform cost reporting for the local facilities housing state inmates. Costs could be reported by administration, incarceration, rehabilitation, and health. This type of reporting would be more reflective of costs reported by the state prisons and might give legislative, department, and local officials an idea of**

how much money is actually spent on the DOC inmates and for what types of programs.

Matter for Legislative Consideration

- 5.1 The legislature may wish to consider, and communicate to DOC, what cost components should be reported by the local jails regarding the housing of state inmates. Cost reporting requirements could then be developed and monitored by DOC. Ultimately, DOC and the local facilities could report the requested cost information to the legislature.**

Chapter 6: Rehabilitation and Recidivism

Chapter Conclusions

The number of Louisiana's adult inmates in state facilities grew by 57.5 percent (7,050 inmates) between 1989 and 1999. By 2004, the adult inmate population in state facilities is projected to grow an additional 18.4 percent.

One way that Louisiana can seek to meet this projected influx of new state inmates is by seeking to reduce our state's recidivism rate. One means of reducing recidivism could involve increased reliance on inmate rehabilitation programs.

In fiscal year 1998-99, Louisiana spent more than \$6 million for adult prison rehabilitation programs. Yet currently it is nearly impossible to determine if the state's recidivism rate is impacted by the millions of dollars spent each year on rehabilitation programs. Because of the amount of funds being spent, it may be of interest to the legislature and to the DOC to consider whether rehabilitation programs have a beneficial impact on the recidivism rates of former inmates and, therefore, on the safety of the Louisiana public.

The DOC and local correctional facilities have not regularly compiled program-specific recidivism information that could serve to support the cost-effectiveness of these programs. Several months ago, the DOC began an organized effort to collect recidivism information on inmates who participate in certain types of rehabilitation. Beginning in the next fiscal year, legislative and department officials should begin to receive information about the effect of rehabilitation on recidivism.

There is no consensus among researchers as to whether rehabilitation programs reduce recidivism. Researchers found that drug treatment programs may reduce recidivism. In addition, sex offender programs may have an impact on recidivism. However, studies present differing conclusions on the impact of these programs. The impacts of education programs and prison industry programs remain unclear among researchers.

Minnesota is a state that places great emphasis on rehabilitation as a means of curbing recidivism. In 1995, Minnesota's DOC spent more than \$17 million on rehabilitation programs for adult institutions. Yet Minnesota's recidivism rates do not vary appreciably from those of other states.

Louisiana ranks near the bottom of the Southern states in the percentage of the state corrections budget that is allocated to rehabilitation programs, but its recidivism rates are average. Although Louisiana has a comparatively low level of rehabilitation program funding (more than \$6 million in fiscal year 1998-99), our recidivism rate for adult offenders is essentially identical to that found in Minnesota. Louisiana's recidivism rate for inmates in adult facilities within three years after release is 40.3 percent, compared with 40 percent in Minnesota.

In 1993, the U.S. Justice Department conducted a study of Hunt Correctional Center's boot camp program (the IMPACT program). This study found no statistically significant differences in arrest rates during the first six months of community supervision between those who completed the IMPACT program and those who either dropped out of the program or did not participate. A 1996 U.S. Justice Department study found that graduates of Louisiana's boot camp program did have a lower recidivism rate than other inmates. However, the 1996 study attributed this lower recidivism rate to the intensive supervision received by the former boot camp inmates following their release, not to their boot camp experience.

Beginning in 1997, only offenders with substance abuse problems have been going through the IMPACT program. DOC data indicate that the recidivism rate for IMPACT graduates three years after release from custody (36.3 percent) is lower than the recidivism rate (of 40.3 percent) for the overall inmate population three years after release.

There is no consensus among researchers about whether prison rehabilitation programs reduce recidivism. However, studies of the Blue Walters substance abuse program at Dixon Correctional Institute and of vocational and GED programs at the Louisiana Correctional Institute for Women support the value of rehabilitation programs in reducing

recidivism. Specifically, the Blue Walters study suggests that rehabilitation, when coupled with post-release follow-up, may be effective in reducing recidivism and promoting employment. The LCIW study concluded that education programs reduce recidivism.

DOC and the Vo-Tech System Spent \$6 Million on Rehabilitation in Fiscal Year 1998-99

Louisiana spent at least \$6 million in fiscal year 1998-99 on prison rehabilitation programs. Exhibit 6-1 on page 99 shows the amount of inmate rehabilitation expenditures for the DOC and the Louisiana Community and Technical College System in fiscal year 1998-99. Rehabilitation programs at DOC's state correctional facilities include academic and vocational, religious, recreational, and pre-release programs. DOC and the Community and Technical College System expenditures do not include rehabilitation funds that may be provided by other state, federal, or private sources. These other sources include the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, the federal Job Training Partnership Act, the Louisiana Department of Social Services, the Louisiana Department of Health and Hospitals, and the Red Cross.

DOC Recently Began to Compile Recidivism Data for Rehabilitation Programs

Louisiana previously did little to determine the recidivism impact of rehabilitation programs on its former inmate population. However, DOC recently began to put a system in place to compile recidivism statistics for certain individual rehabilitation programs. Despite their stated belief in the effectiveness of rehabilitation programs, correctional facility rehabilitation officials told us that their institutions do not track recidivism rates of their former inmates. A number of these officials said that they would like to gather statistics on recidivism, but lack the resources to do so.

The DOC has recently begun measuring the recidivism rates of inmates who have participated in the following rehabilitation programs:

- Blue Walters Substance Abuse
- Education
- Work Release
- Faith-Based
- Project Metamorphosis
- Job Skills Education Program (JSEP)
- IMPACT (Boot Camp)

Officials at DOC have told us they plan to measure the impact of these programs on recidivism for a period of five years. They will have a system in place by June 2000, to begin measuring program impact.

Recommendation

- 6.1 The DOC, in cooperation with the OPB and legislative staff, should regularly gather and report performance information related to the success of rehabilitation programs in curbing recidivism. This information should include DOC inmates being housed in local jails.**

The gathering and reporting of this information on the relationship between rehabilitation and recidivism may assist the legislature in its budget deliberations. It can help to determine whether the funds currently provided for rehabilitation have a cost-effective impact on reducing the recidivism rate of Louisiana inmates.

Louisiana's DOC defines recidivism as "Return to DPS&C [DOC] custody following conviction for a new felony or technical revocation of supervision after having been released from DPS&C incarceration." Based on that definition, Louisiana's three-year recidivism rate is about 40 percent. Louisiana's rate differs little from recidivism rates in other states. But we do not know whether our recidivism rate is impacted by the millions of dollars we spend each year on prison rehabilitation programs. This is a matter of both social and fiscal importance. When an inmate recidivates and returns to DOC jurisdiction, the state is faced with a minimum yearly cost of \$8,395, calculated on the basis of the \$23 per diem currently paid to local jails to house a DOC inmate.

Exhibit 6-1 on the following page shows the amount of funds being spent for rehabilitation. Because of the amount being spent, it may be of interest to the legislature and to the DOC to consider whether rehabilitation programs have a beneficial impact on the recidivism rates of former inmates. This is also an issue that directly impacts the safety of the Louisiana public.

Exhibit 6-1				
Louisiana's Prison Rehabilitation Expenditures				
DOC and Louisiana Community and Technical College System				
Fiscal Year 1998-1999				
Facility	DOC Expenditures	Technical College System Expenditures	Total Rehabilitation Expenditures	Rehabilitation Cost Per Inmate Day
Phelps	\$112,598	\$489,216	\$601,814	\$2.03
Angola	\$542,486	\$566,137	\$1,108,623	\$.59
Allen	\$1,067,533*	\$95,242	\$1,162,775	\$2.10
Avoyelles	\$153,461	\$299,744	\$453,205	\$.81
L. C. I. W.	\$167,506	\$349,615	\$517,121	\$1.57
Dixon	\$205,517	\$223,475	\$428,992	\$.74
Hunt	\$224,065	\$731,637	\$955,702	\$1.24
Wade	\$88,755	\$422,074	\$510,829	\$.98
WCI	\$159,394	\$179,469	\$338,863	\$.77
Winn	\$609,575*	0	\$609,575	\$1.11
Work Training Facility-North	0	\$64,019	\$64,019	\$.36
Totals:	\$3,330,890	\$3,420,628	\$6,751,518	\$1.02
<p>Note: *These amounts are an allocation of the contract payments to these facilities by DOC. The allocation is based on cost data that were provided to us by Winn and Allen.</p> <p>Source: Compiled by Legislative Auditor staff from information furnished by DOC and separate campuses of the Louisiana Community and Technical College System.</p>				

Recidivism: Background Data

Several studies of recidivism have demonstrated that a relatively small group of recidivists are responsible for a large number of serious crimes. Surveys of large numbers of jail and prison inmates indicate that 10 to 20 percent of offenders account for 70 to 80 percent of serious violent and property crimes committed by these inmates. (William Spelman, Criminal Incapacitation, 1994, based on 1975, 1976, and 1978 Rand surveys in California, Michigan, and Texas)

A 1989 study on recidivism by the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics tracked 16,000 inmates released in eleven states. This study found that 63 percent of state inmates were arrested for a felony or serious misdemeanor within three years of release. Almost half (47 percent) were convicted, and 41 percent returned

to jail or prison for a new offense or for violation of the terms of their release.

Offenders most likely to be re-arrested were car thieves. Those least likely to be re-arrested were inmates convicted of murder or manslaughter. This study, not surprisingly, also found recidivism rates to rise with the number of prior arrests. Recidivism rates were also higher among younger offenders, among men, and among those without high school diplomas.

Rehabilitation Programs: No Consensus About Their Impact on Recidivism

There is no consensus among researchers as to whether rehabilitation programs reduce recidivism. Researchers have compared recidivism rates of offenders participating in programs with the recidivism rates of those who did not participate. Yet the fundamental question of how much (if at all) rehabilitation programs reduce recidivism continues to be an issue of lively debate. In addition to studying the overall impact of rehabilitation programs, these researchers have sought to identify particular types of programs that may be effective in reducing recidivism, either for all inmates or for inmates sentenced for specific types of offenses.

Any analysis of the impact of rehabilitation programs on recidivism should consider the independent variable of inmate motivation. An inmate who chooses to enroll in a rehabilitation program may be more motivated to change his life than an inmate who has not enrolled. Rehabilitation programs could serve to support an inmate's determination to turn his life around. With that in mind, in the following pages we briefly review the conclusions of some recent studies of rehabilitation programs.

Drug Treatment Programs May Reduce Recidivism

Drug treatment programs may be effective in reducing recidivism. A recent research summary ("Treatment for Drug-Abusing Offenders Under Community Supervision," *Federal Probation*, December 1995) reported that drug treatment programs (either voluntary or mandatory) can reduce recidivism, especially when this treatment is matched to offender needs. However, effective drug treatment programs in correctional settings were said to require the following elements:

- Competent and committed staff
- Support of correctional authorities
- Adequate resources

- Comprehensive, intensive therapy, aimed at changing offender lifestyles, not just substance abuse problems
- Continuity of care following program completion

A 1997 study by Dr. Charles Grenier examined the effectiveness of Louisiana's Blue Walters Program, a pre-release substance abuse treatment program. The study, which will be discussed at greater length later in this chapter, found the Blue Walters Program existing at that time had beneficial effects, both on recidivism and on employment. Since this 1997 study was completed, the scope of the Blue Walters program has been reduced.

Sex Offender Programs May Have a Small Impact on Recidivism

Research studies present differing conclusions on the impact of sex offender programs on recidivism. However, some sex offender treatment programs may achieve small reductions in the incidence of future sex crimes. A 1995 article ("Sexual Offender Recidivism Revisited"), by Gordon C. Nagayama Hall, published in the "Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology," reviewed twelve studies. It concluded that 19 percent of sex offenders who participated in sex offender rehabilitation programs committed new sex offenses, compared with 27 percent of sex offenders who were not in these programs.

Impact of Education Programs Is Uncertain

Studies of education programs differ about their impact on recidivism. The 1989 study by the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics found recidivism rates to be higher among inmates without high school diplomas. This raises the question of whether education programs are effective in reducing inmate recidivism rates.

A 1995 analysis of previous education studies ("Adult Academic and Vocational Correctional Education Programs: A Review of Recent Research"), by Jung Gerber and Eric J. Fritsch, looked at the impact of pre-college, college, and vocational education programs on recidivism. Three of the pre-college prison education studies that were reviewed found these programs to reduce recidivism, while three studies did not. Four studies found college level prison education programs to reduce recidivism, while two studies did not find this relationship. Four studies found vocational education to reduce recidivism, while two studies did not.

A 1994 study of 14,000 Texas inmates by Kenneth Adams, published in the December 1994 issue of "The Prison Journal," presents a more consistently positive picture about the impact of education programs on recidivism. This study found that all inmates with intensive participation in prison education programs (more than a total of 200 hours) benefited from these programs, in the form of reduced recidivism. The inmates who benefited most from these programs were those who entered them with the lowest levels of education. These inmates had a recidivism rate one-third less than that of non-participants.

A 1998 study by Dr. Henry E. Sanders, Jr., of recidivism rates of inmates completing education courses at the Louisiana Correctional Institute for Women found results similar to those of Texas. This study will be discussed later in this chapter.

**Impact of Prison
Industry
Programs on
Recidivism Is
Unclear**

Studies of prison industry programs disagree about their impact on recidivism. A 1989 review by Timothy Flanagan ("Prison Labor and Industry") of studies from Utah, Ohio, Florida, and New York concluded that these studies presented a largely pessimistic picture of the impact of such programs on recidivism. Yet a 1996 federal study by William G. Saylor and George G. Gacs ("A Study of Rehabilitating Inmates Through Industrial Work Participation and Vocational and Apprenticeship Training") found recidivism among prison industry program participants to be 6.6 percent after one year, compared with 10.1 percent for non-participants.

**Minnesota
Provides Little
Support for the
Value of
Rehabilitation
Programs in
Reducing
Recidivism**

Minnesota is a state that places great emphasis on rehabilitation as a means of curbing recidivism. Yet its recidivism rates do not vary appreciably from those of other states. The Minnesota Commissioner of the Department of Corrections is, by law, required to develop "more effective treatment programs directed toward the correction and rehabilitation of persons found delinquent or guilty of crimes." Officials of that state's Department of Corrections have told Minnesota legislators that one of the reasons they spend more per inmate than most other states is because of their programs to reduce recidivism.

In 1995, Minnesota's DOC spent more than \$17 million on rehabilitation programs for adult institutions. Yet Minnesota's recidivism rates do not vary appreciably from those of other states. Although Louisiana has a comparatively low level of rehabilitation

program funding (more than \$6 million from both DOC and the technical college system in fiscal year 1998-99), our recidivism rate for adult offenders is essentially identical to that found in Minnesota. Louisiana's recidivism rate for inmates in adult facilities within three years after release is 40.3 percent, compared with 40 percent in Minnesota.

According to a report of the Minnesota Legislative Auditor, more than 42 percent of Minnesota's prison inmates participate in work programs, with almost one-third of inmates engaged in vocational, GED, literacy, or post-secondary education programs. As can be seen in Exhibit 6-3 on page 106, 3.5 percent of Louisiana's inmates participate in on-the-job training programs. A total of 16.7 percent of Louisiana's inmates are in vocational, GED, literacy, or post-secondary education programs.

With the emphasis Minnesota places on rehabilitation, it is reasonable to assume that there, if anywhere, these programs would reduce recidivism. However, about 59 percent of released Minnesota prisoners were re-arrested in Minnesota for a new felony or gross misdemeanor within three years of their release, with 45 percent being convicted and 40 percent being returned to prison. These recidivism figures do not differ appreciably from the 63 percent arrest rate, the 47 percent conviction rate, and the 41 percent incarceration rate found when the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics studied recidivism rates in eleven states. (This study is described on page 99.)

The Minnesota Legislative Auditor's Office studied the impact of that state's rehabilitation efforts. It concluded that "Recidivism rates of inmates who participated in prison programs were usually similar to the rates of those who did not."

Rehabilitation Might Help Control Growth of Inmates

As was seen in Chapter 2, the number of Louisiana's adult inmates in state facilities grew by 57.5 percent (7,050 inmates) between 1989 and 1999, and continued growth is projected. To help accommodate this growth in state inmate population, the DOC has projected an increase of almost 10,000 inmate beds at Louisiana's adult correctional facilities, work release centers, and local facilities by 2003, at a cost to the state of more than \$120 million.

Louisiana can seek to meet this projected influx of new state inmates by building additional state prisons, by increasing the number of state inmates incarcerated in local facilities, by

considering alternative sentencing methods, or by seeking to reduce our state's recidivism rate. One means of reducing recidivism could involve increased reliance on inmate rehabilitation programs. We will, therefore, now examine rehabilitation programs in Louisiana and their possible impact on inmate recidivism.

Louisiana's Recidivism Rate Is Average

The recidivism rate for adult offenders in Louisiana is essentially identical to that found in the Bureau of Justice Statistics and the Minnesota studies, despite a comparatively low level of rehabilitation program funding in Louisiana. In order to use figures comparable to those in the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics and Minnesota studies, we will focus on the recidivism figures for Louisiana inmates returned to Louisiana custody three years after their release.

According to information provided by the DOC's Office of Information Services, the recidivism rate for Louisiana inmates in adult facilities is 40.3 percent within three years after release. The Louisiana recidivism rate varies little from the rates found for eleven states by the Bureau of Justice Statistics study and for Minnesota by that state's Auditor's Office. As can be seen in Exhibit 6-2, about one out of every eight released adult offenders in Louisiana is returned to the DOC's custody within one year of release. This proportion climbs to one half of offenders returned to DOC custody within seven years of release. While it does not appear that Louisiana is doing worse in its recidivism rate than the average state, neither, apparently, are we doing better.

Exhibit 6-2				
Adult Recidivism Rates in Louisiana*				
Release Year	Number Released	Follow Up Period	Number Returned	Recidivism Rate
1991	6,730	7 years	3,365	50.0%
1992	9,031	6 years	4,500	49.8%
1993	9,782	5 years	4,769	48.8%
1994	10,537	4 years	4,785	45.4%
1995	11,407	3 years	4,594	40.3%
1996	12,234	2 years	3,670	30.0%
1997	12,773	1 year	1,556	12.2%
Source: Developed by Legislative Auditor's staff from information provided by DOC's Office of Information Services.				
Note: *These statistics include state inmates in local jails and work release centers, as well as those in state facilities.				

Louisiana's standing in rehabilitation program enrollment presents a mixed picture. However, the percentage of Louisiana's corrections budget devoted to rehabilitation ranks toward the bottom of the Southern states. In Exhibit 6-3 on the following page, we compare the percentage of Louisiana's state inmates enrolled in rehabilitation programs with the percentage of state inmates enrolled in rehabilitation programs in other Southern Legislative Conference states. For Louisiana and the other Southern states, these figures relate to state inmates housed in state, but not local, facilities. Exhibit 6-3 also compares the percentage of our corrections budget allocated to rehabilitation programs with the percentage allocated to rehabilitation in these other Southern states.

As can be seen in Exhibit 6-3, Louisiana ranks as follows:

- Thirteenth among 16 reporting states in adult basic education enrollment
- Fifth among 12 reporting states in literacy enrollment
- Sixth among 15 reporting states in vocational education enrollment
- Fourth among seven reporting states in on-the-job training enrollment
- Twelfth among 16 reporting states in the number of inmates receiving GEDs
- Eleventh among 12 reporting states in the percentage of the DOC budget spent on rehabilitation

Exhibit 6-3							
Percentage of Inmates Enrolled in Rehabilitation Programs							
Louisiana and Southern Legislative Conference States							
Fiscal Year 1998-99							
State	Adult Basic Education	Literacy Programs	Vocational Education	Religious Guidance	On-The-Job Training	Number Receiving GED	Percentage of DOC Budget Spent on Rehab
Alabama	8.3%	N/A	N/A	6.8%	N/A	2.1%	N/A
Arkansas	31.1%	19.2%	2.4%	3.3%	5.1%	7.8%	N/A
Florida	8.3%	2.5%	5.4%	49.7%	0.7%	3.1%	1.8%
Georgia	4.1%	2.4%	1.5%	36.0%	0.1%	4.5%	0.5%
Kentucky	9.7%	3.5%	3.7%	N/A	N/A	3.9%	2.0%
Louisiana	5.2%	8.4%	4.9%	N/A	3.5%	2.7%	0.7%
Maryland	13.7%	8.3%	3.7%	52.1%	5.8%	4.4%	N/A
Mississippi	2.6%	N/A	3.0%	101.9%*	N/A	1.1%	1.5%
Missouri	27.6%	N/A	2.6%	35.0%	N/A	9.5%	10.4%
North Carolina	5.9%	6.0%	5.5%	4.5%	N/A	4.5%	5.8%
Oklahoma	3.5%	3.8%	2.3%	N/A	N/A	6.4%	6.0%
South Carolina	25.0%	17.5%	4.3%	37.1%	0	4.4%	4.2%
Tennessee	12.8%	**	7.7%	N/A	N/A	2.5%	2.0%
Texas	17.5%	17.5%	3.6%	17.9%	0.2%	2.9%	6.0%
Virginia	20.5%	6.7%	6.4%	N/A	N/A	2.1%	N/A
West Virginia	12.3%	13.0%	13.1%	20.0%	22.6%	4.8%	10.0%

Source: Developed by Legislative Auditor's staff from information contained in 1999 Adult Correctional Systems report of the Louisiana Legislative Fiscal Office.

Notes: *This percentage was obtained by dividing the reported average 1999 monthly enrollment in Religious guidance programs (9,910) by the reported July 1, 1999, adult inmate population in state facilities (9,724).

**Tennessee's Adult Basic Education and Literacy program figures are combined.

Louisiana Ranks Low in Rehabilitation Spending

As seen in Exhibit 6-3, Louisiana ranks near the bottom of the Southern states in the percentage of the state corrections budget that is allocated to rehabilitation programs. Although Louisiana devotes a smaller proportion of its corrections budget to rehabilitation than many other states, it has a recidivism rate that is essentially average. Therefore, one must question whether there is any connection between rehabilitation program spending and successful rehabilitation of prison inmates. This issue of rehabilitation and its impact on recidivism will now be considered further, as we describe the results of interviews we conducted with Louisiana rehabilitation officials and studies related to rehabilitation in Louisiana.

Rehabilitation officials at the correctional facilities we visited generally state that rehabilitation programs curb recidivism. But officials at the following prisons and local jails told us they are not collecting recidivism statistics:

- Allen Correctional Center
- Bridge City Correctional Center for Youth
- Hunt Correctional Center
- Jetson Correctional Center for Youth
- Orleans Parish Prison
- Riverbend Detention Center
- Winn Correctional Center

Despite the ambiguous data presented by various studies on the linkage between rehabilitation programs and reductions in recidivism, most rehabilitation officials we interviewed at Louisiana's prisons and jails strongly support the existence of such a linkage. They assert that the programs they administer reduce recidivism rates of inmates who participate in them. A number of these officials added that the impact of rehabilitation programs on recidivism is related to the inmate's desire to change the way he or she has been living.

One type of program that, since 1987, has sought to reduce recidivism in Louisiana is the boot camp program. In this state, the boot camp program is known as IMPACT (Intensive Motivational Program of Alternative Correctional Treatment).

Recidivism Effect of Hunt's Boot Camp Program Is Questionable

Hunt Correctional Center's boot camp program may improve inmate attitudes, but is not shown to reduce recidivism. Information provided by Hunt lists reducing recidivism as a goal of its IMPACT boot camp program. As Hunt puts it: "The highly structured IMPACT program promotes and provides an atmosphere for offenders to learn personal confidence, personal responsibility, self-respect, and respect for others attitudes and value systems. The program is based on the expectation that the acquisition of the above skills and personal abilities will significantly increase offenders' abilities to lead law-abiding, creative and fulfilling lives as contributing members of a free society." In short, the IMPACT program is to have a favorable effect on recidivism.

The IMPACT program at Hunt, according to a 1993 U.S. Department of Justice study by Doris MacKenzie, James Shaw, and Voncile Gowdy, incorporates the following elements that research has shown to be associated with rehabilitation:

- Strict rules and authority
- Anti-criminal modeling and reinforcement
- Problem solving
- Use of community resources
- Development of interpersonal relationships

According to this U.S. Justice Department study, inmates who have completed the Hunt IMPACT program report more positive attitudes, are more optimistic about their futures, have more positive attitudes toward prison staff than other inmates, and state their IMPACT experience was beneficial. However, the Justice Department study refers to the effectiveness of IMPACT in reducing recidivism as “questionable.” The study finds no statistically significant differences in arrest rates during the first six months of community supervision between those who completed the IMPACT program and those who either dropped out of the program or did not participate.

A 1996 U.S. Justice Department study by Doris MacKenzie and Claire Souryal found that graduates of Louisiana’s boot camp program are less likely to commit new crimes. However, this study attributes the lower rate of recidivism not to the boot camp experience but to intensive supervision received by these former inmates following their release.

Beginning in 1997, only offenders with substance abuse problems have been going through the IMPACT program. According to DOC data, the recidivism rate for IMPACT graduates released from DOC custody in 1997 is 36.3 percent as of January 2000. This recidivism rate is lower than the 40.3 percent rate for all inmates three years after release from custody.

Two Louisiana Studies Suggest the Value of Rehabilitation Programs

A study of the Blue Walters rehabilitation program suggests that rehabilitation, when coupled with post-release follow-up, may be effective in reducing recidivism and promoting employment. However, other data (such as those contained in the 1989 U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics study and the Minnesota study) appear to undermine these findings. This February 1997 study by Dr. Charles Grenier evaluated the impact of the Blue Walters and Follow Up Intervention Program on the following variables:

- Recidivism
- Employment
- Substance Abuse Treatment Program Participation
- Alcohol Abuse
- Drug Abuse

The Blue Walters Program, at the time of this study, was a sixty-day, pre-release substance abuse treatment program. The goal of this program is to reduce recidivism through a structured program of substance abuse intervention, education, and rehabilitation.

According to officials we interviewed at Blue Walters, the scope of this program was reduced in 1998 to that of a six-week, non-intensive outpatient program. Therefore, the 1997 study conclusions about the effectiveness of this program may not relate to the current Blue Walters program.

Another issue to consider, which is stated directly in the 1997 Blue Walters report, is that “the results cannot be generalized beyond the samples drawn for this study, and beyond the time frame specified in the design.” The study, therefore, is a study of the two groups of inmates that comprised the treatment and the control groups. **The study does not claim to reach an overall conclusion about the effectiveness of the Blue Walters Program.**

**Study Found
Better Recidivism
and Employment
Results for
Program
Participants**

The Blue Walters study finds a substantially lower recidivism rate and a beneficial impact on employment for the treatment group. In a one-year period following release, 26.6 percent of the former inmates in the treatment group were returned to custody, either for parole revocation or for a new felony. In contrast, almost half (48.5 percent) of the members of the control group not in the treatment program were returned to custody during this one-year period.

This study also finds completion of Blue Walters and participation in its follow-up program had a beneficial impact on employment for these inmates. While fewer than one out of five (17.2 percent) of the members of the control group are engaged in continuous full-time or part-time work, 37.5 percent of the members of the treatment group are employed. More than half (51.6 percent) of the control group are unemployed, compared with 35.6 percent of the treatment group.

However, the study finds no statistically significant difference between the two groups regarding alcohol and drug use. This may be somewhat surprising, since a goal of the Blue Walters program is to motivate inmates to remain free from alcohol and drugs following their release.

**LCIW Study
Concludes That
Education
Programs Reduce
Recidivism**

A study by Dr. Henry E. Sanders, Jr., in 1998, examined the impact on recidivism of vocational and GED courses at the Louisiana Correctional Institute for Women (LCIW) and found those who complete these courses have lower recidivism rates than non-participants. This study examines two groups of 130 inmates each at the LCIW. One group completed a vocational or GED course. The other group did not participate in any of these courses.

This study finds that those who completed any of four available courses had lower recidivism rates than non-participants. This was found to be true in each of seven years examined. The courses available at LCIW at the time of the study were:

- Custom Sewing
- Office Occupations
- Upholstery
- GED Preparation

Exhibit 6-4 shows the cumulative recidivism rates for course completers and non-participants.

Exhibit 6-4			
Recidivism Rates of LCIW Education Course Completers and Non-Participants			
Number of Years Following Release	Course Completer Recidivism	Course Non- Participant Recidivism	Totals
One Year	6 (4.6%)	12 (9.2%)	18 (6.9%)
Two Years	16 (12.3%)	25 (19.2%)	41 (15.8%)
Three Years	22 (16.9%)	37 (28.5%)	59 (22.7%)
Four Years	27 (20.8%)	38 (29.2%)	65 (25.0%)
Five Years	28 (21.5%)	39 (30.0%)	67 (25.8%)
Six Years	28 (21.5%)	42 (32.3%)	70 (26.9%)
Seven Years	29 (22.3%)	42 (32.3%)	71 (27.3%)
Source: Developed by Legislative Auditor's staff from information in a 1998 Dissertation by Dr. Henry E. Sanders, Jr., <u>Vocational Education and Recidivism at the Louisiana Correctional Institute for Women.</u>			

It can be seen that LCIW inmates who completed an education course were, in each year, less likely to return to prison than course non-participants. If the 130 LCIW inmates who completed a vocational or GED course had recidivated at the same rate as those who did not take a course, there would have been an additional cost of \$77,263 for a year's incarceration. This computation is based on a daily LCIW cost of \$35.28 per inmate in fiscal year 1998-99, and six fewer course completers recidivating. After seven years, this additional cost to the state would have grown to \$167,404 per year. These findings support the value of prison education courses in Louisiana in reducing recidivism.

Though the evidence from the studies of eleven states and from Minnesota indicate no clear linkage between rehabilitation programs and recidivism, the LCIW rehabilitation study supports a reduction in recidivism associated with participation in certain programs.

Since, as was seen in Chapter 5, some 40 percent of all Louisiana state inmates are housed in local jails, the DOC and the legislature may wish to consider the rehabilitation needs of these state inmates. Under the current Basic Jail Guidelines, local

facilities are not required to provide rehabilitation programs to state inmates.

Matter for Legislative Consideration

- 6.1 The legislature and the DOC may wish to mandate further study of the relationship between rehabilitation programs and reductions in inmate recidivism in Louisiana. Based on careful consideration of information obtained from all available studies, the legislature may wish to consider the desirability of requiring rehabilitation programs for the state inmates currently housed in local jails.**

Appendix A

Analysis of Operating Costs of Adult and Juvenile Facilities

Appendix A: Analysis of Operating Costs of Adult and Juvenile Facilities

Angola

	Actual 97-98	Avg. Cost/Day	Actual 98-99	Avg. Cost/Day
Administration	\$6,986,848	\$3.75	\$4,650,713	\$2.49
Salaries	\$1,254,653	\$0.67	\$1,234,758	\$0.66
Other Compensation	\$136,308	\$0.07	\$111,798	\$0.06
Benefits	\$202,314	\$0.11	\$191,125	\$0.10
Travel	\$17,034	\$0.01	\$9,869	\$0.01
Maintenance	\$94,889	\$0.05	\$107,757	\$0.06
Communications	\$281,654	\$0.15	\$271,159	\$0.15
Utilities	\$2,928,793	\$1.57	\$2,468,773	\$1.32
Other Operations	\$1,783,946	\$0.96	\$115,135	\$0.06
Supplies	\$215,326	\$0.12	\$118,303	\$0.06
Capital Outlay	\$48,323	\$0.03	\$3,635	\$0.00
Other Charges	\$23,608	\$0.01	\$18,401	\$0.01
Incarceration	\$55,580,385	\$29.86	\$58,848,471	\$31.50
Salaries	\$38,050,469	\$20.44	\$39,845,645	\$21.33
OT Comp.	\$626,104	\$0.34	\$895,288	\$0.48
Benefits	\$5,861,724	\$3.15	\$6,011,940	\$3.22
Travel	\$19,636	\$0.01	\$19,844	\$0.01
Maintenance	\$246,167	\$0.13	\$247,914	\$0.13
Rent	\$364,708	\$0.20	\$446,450	\$0.24
Communications			\$916	\$0.00
Utilities	\$377	\$0.00	\$237	\$0.00
Other Operations	\$293,308	\$0.16	\$440,533	\$0.24
Supplies	\$9,220,319	\$4.95	\$9,486,863	\$5.08
Professional Services	\$619,279	\$0.33	\$747,802	\$0.40
Other Charges	\$7,500	\$0.00		
Capital Outlay	\$270,794	\$0.15	\$641,083	\$0.34
Major Repairs	\$0	\$0.00	\$63,956	\$0.03
Rehabilitation	\$523,715	\$0.28	\$542,486	\$0.29
Health	\$9,545,123	\$5.13	\$10,678,355	\$5.72
Total	\$72,636,071	\$39.02	\$74,720,025	\$40.00
# of Inmates	5,100		5,118	
Total Staff	1744		1799	
Inmates/Staff	2.92		2.84	
Incarceration Staff	1539		1588	
Inmates/Inc. Staff	3.31		3.22	

LCIW

	Actual 97-98	Avg. Cost/Day	Actual 98-99	Avg. Cost/Day
Administration	\$1,153,937	\$3.61	\$886,365	\$2.69
Salaries	\$429,272	\$1.34	\$561,241	\$1.70
Other Compensation	\$27,254	\$0.09	\$18,602	\$0.06
Benefits	\$53,892	\$0.17	\$77,559	\$0.24
Travel	\$694	\$0.00	\$3,048	\$0.01
Maintenance	\$0	\$0.00	\$3,158	\$0.01
Communications	\$47,691	\$0.15	\$50,033	\$0.15
Utilities	\$127,149	\$0.40	\$134,975	\$0.41
Other Operations	\$445,990	\$1.39	\$3,324	\$0.01
Supplies	\$5,801	\$0.02	\$18,473	\$0.06
Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0.00	\$12,910	\$0.04
Other Charges	\$16,194	\$0.05	\$3,042	\$0.01
Incarceration	\$7,894,936	\$24.72	\$8,398,710	\$25.48
Salaries	\$4,951,184	\$15.50	\$5,266,788	\$15.98
Other Compensation	\$27,085	\$0.08	\$39,410	\$0.12
Benefits	\$760,695	\$2.38	\$809,237	\$2.46
Travel	\$3,444	\$0.01	\$11,263	\$0.03
Maintenance	\$209,191	\$0.66	\$175,483	\$0.53
Rent	\$159,903	\$0.50	\$84,697	\$0.26
Communications	\$3,202	\$0.01	\$66,424	\$0.20
Utilities	\$1,559	\$0.00	\$219	\$0.00
Other Operations	\$34,486	\$0.11	\$45,870	\$0.14
Supplies	\$1,378,544	\$4.32	\$1,280,605	\$3.89
Professional Services	\$1,949	\$0.01	\$16,189	\$0.05
Other Charges	\$601	\$0.00	\$1,050	\$0.00
Capital Outlay	\$323,436	\$1.02	\$600,637	\$1.82
Major Repairs	\$39,657	\$0.12	\$838	\$0.00
Rehabilitation	\$114,375	\$0.36	\$167,506	\$0.51
Health	\$1,791,778	\$5.61	\$2,175,568	\$6.60
Total	\$10,955,026	\$34.30	\$11,628,149	\$35.28
# of Inmates	875		903	
Total Staff	318		332	
Inmates/Staff	2.75		2.72	
Incarceration Staff	246		289	
Inmates/Inc. Staff	3.56		3.12	

Hunt

	Actual 97-98	Avg. Cost/Day	Actual 98-99	Avg. Cost/Day
Administration	\$3,818,965	\$5.23	\$2,459,157	\$3.20
Salaries	\$685,851	\$0.94	\$686,068	\$0.89
Other Compensation			\$489	\$0.00
Benefits	\$113,264	\$0.16	\$112,722	\$0.15
Travel	\$895	\$0.00	\$2,193	\$0.00
Maintenance	\$60,208	\$0.08	\$60,374	\$0.08
Communications	\$61,386	\$0.08	\$76,183	\$0.10
Utilities	\$1,483,303	\$2.04	\$1,446,993	\$1.88
Other Operations	\$1,272,085	\$1.74	\$29,251	\$0.04
Supplies	\$66,799	\$0.09	\$16,568	\$0.02
Capital Outlay	\$924	\$0.00		
Other Charges	\$74,250	\$0.10	\$28,316	\$0.04
Incarceration	\$22,014,097	\$30.17	\$23,496,325	\$30.54
Salaries	\$13,215,815	\$18.10	\$13,602,694	\$17.68
Other Compensation	\$439,020	\$0.60	\$551,940	\$0.72
Benefits	\$2,219,980	\$3.04	\$2,222,794	\$2.89
Travel	\$2,084	\$0.00	\$12,468	\$0.02
Maintenance	\$32,837	\$0.05	\$78,529	\$0.10
Rent	\$4,640	\$0.01	\$40,357	\$0.05
Utilities	\$370	\$0.00	\$217	\$0.00
Other Operations	\$73,807	\$0.10	\$94,897	\$0.12
Supplies	\$2,377,479	\$3.26	\$3,044,559	\$3.96
Professional Services	\$3,964	\$0.01	\$2,542	\$0.00
Other Charges			\$2,860	\$0.00
Capital Outlay	\$334,510	\$0.46	\$369,785	\$0.48
Major Repairs	\$282,129	\$0.39	\$96,513	\$0.13
ARDC	\$3,027,462	\$4.15	\$3,376,170	\$4.39
Rehabilitation	\$232,755	\$0.32	\$224,065	\$0.29
Health	\$3,960,361	\$5.43	\$4,508,289	\$5.86
Total	\$30,026,178	\$41.15	\$30,687,836	\$39.89
# of Inmates	1,999		2,108	
Total Staff	813		812	
Inmates/Staff	2.46		2.60	
Incarceration Staff	626		622	
Inmates/Inc. Staff	3.19		3.39	

Wade

	Actual 97-98	Avg. Cost/Day	Actual 98-99	Avg. Cost/Day
Administration	\$2,167,223	\$4.51	\$1,827,512	\$3.51
Salaries	\$495,315	\$1.03	\$573,509	\$1.10
Other Compensation	\$1,399	\$0.00	\$6,211	\$0.01
Benefits	\$79,816	\$0.17	\$94,545	\$0.18
Travel	\$8,144	\$0.02	\$12,032	\$0.02
Maintenance	\$162	\$0.00	\$250	\$0.00
Communications	\$57,740	\$0.12	\$69,081	\$0.13
Utilities	\$853,552	\$1.77	\$867,058	\$1.67
Other Operations	\$532,412	\$1.11	\$16,753	\$0.03
Supplies	\$55,140	\$0.11	\$61,259	\$0.12
Capital Outlay	\$65,080	\$0.14	\$24,589	\$0.05
Other Charges	\$18,463	\$0.04	\$102,225	\$0.20
Incarceration	\$14,205,103	\$29.53	\$15,671,915	\$30.09
Salaries	\$9,335,261	\$19.42	\$10,545,822	\$20.25
Other Compensation	\$141,103	\$0.29	\$155,853	\$0.30
Benefits	\$1,401,777	\$2.91	\$1,498,758	\$2.88
Travel	\$11,632	\$0.02	\$28,283	\$0.05
Maintenance	\$106,700	\$0.22	\$126,100	\$0.24
Rent	\$112,880	\$0.23	\$160,582	\$0.31
Communications	\$101	\$0.00	\$0	\$0.00
Utilities	\$360	\$0.00	\$210	\$0.00
Other Operations	\$13,309	\$0.03	\$8,468	\$0.02
Supplies	\$2,413,133	\$5.03	\$2,567,755	\$4.93
Professional Services	\$16,813	\$0.03	\$16,718	\$0.03
Other Charges	\$920	\$0.00	\$8,260	\$0.02
Capital Outlay	\$461,566	\$0.96	\$393,748	\$0.75
Major Repairs	\$189,548	\$0.39	\$161,358	\$0.31
Rehabilitation	\$84,351	\$0.18	\$88,755	\$0.17
Health	\$1,737,789	\$3.61	\$2,116,595	\$4.06
Total	\$18,194,466	\$37.83	\$19,704,777	\$37.83
# of Inmates	1,318		1,427	
Total Staff	591		560	
Inmates/Staff	2.23		2.55	
Incarceration Staff	523		519	
Inmates/Inc. Staff	2.52		2.75	

Dixon

	Actual 97-98	Avg. Cost/Day	Actual 98-99	Avg. Cost/Day
Administration	\$2,011,962	\$3.54	\$1,360,664	\$2.35
Salaries	\$513,533	\$0.90	\$563,348	\$0.97
Other Compensation	\$37,750	\$0.07	\$9,137	\$0.02
Benefits	\$83,258	\$0.15	\$86,885	\$0.15
Travel	\$4,231	\$0.01	\$3,861	\$0.01
Maintenance	\$295	\$0.00	\$320	\$0.00
Communications	\$75,503	\$0.13	\$87,868	\$0.15
Utilities	\$286,582	\$0.50	\$275,687	\$0.48
Other Operations	\$664,546	\$1.17	\$21,109	\$0.04
Supplies	\$56,927	\$0.10	\$27,816	\$0.05
Capital Outlay	\$15,522	\$0.03	\$1,865	\$0.00
Major Repair				
Other Charges	\$273,815	\$0.48	\$280,768	\$0.48
Incarceration	\$16,174,214	\$28.50	\$17,260,560	\$29.76
Salaries	\$10,113,478	\$17.82	\$10,654,815	\$18.37
OT Comp.	\$228,022	\$0.40	\$299,951	\$0.52
Benefits	\$1,685,408	\$2.97	\$1,702,262	\$2.94
Travel	\$10,247	\$0.02	\$18,665	\$0.03
Maintenance	\$82,349	\$0.15	\$74,413	\$0.13
Rent	\$46,061	\$0.08	\$92,466	\$0.16
Communications	\$635	\$0.00	\$0	\$0.00
Utilities	\$720	\$0.00	\$966	\$0.00
Other Operations	\$67,254	\$0.12	\$96,714	\$0.17
Supplies	\$2,377,717	\$4.19	\$2,676,092	\$4.61
Professional Services	\$26,518	\$0.05	\$29,067	\$0.05
Capital Outlay	\$383,899	\$0.68	\$389,003	\$0.67
Major Repairs	\$184,043	\$0.32	\$152,150	\$0.26
Blue Walters	\$967,863	\$1.70	\$1,073,996	\$1.85
Rehabilitation	\$201,956	\$0.36	\$205,517	\$0.35
Health	\$1,683,480	\$2.97	\$1,778,300	\$3.07
Total	\$20,071,612	\$35.37	\$20,605,041	\$35.53
# of Inmates	1,555		1,589	
Total Staff	558		551	
Inmates/Staff	2.79		2.88	
Incarceration Staff	467		481	
Inmates/Inc. Staff	3.33		3.30	

Washington

	Actual 97-98	Avg. Cost/Day	Actual 98-99	Avg. Cost/Day
Administration	\$2,139,448	\$5.28	\$1,139,201	\$2.61
Salaries	\$475,488	\$1.18	\$481,875	\$1.10
Other Compensation	\$5,195	\$0.01	\$3,946	\$0.01
Benefits	\$75,987	\$0.19	\$81,514	\$0.19
Travel	\$748	\$0.00	\$1,178	\$0.00
Maintenance	\$29,146	\$0.07	\$46,936	\$0.11
Communications	\$34,171	\$0.08	\$27,243	\$0.06
Utilities	\$445,180	\$1.10	\$422,745	\$0.97
Other Operations	\$966,067	\$2.38	\$7,073	\$0.02
Supplies	\$19,699	\$0.05	\$8,653	\$0.02
Capital Outlay	\$33,899	\$0.08	\$0	\$0.00
Major Repair	\$19,050	\$0.05	\$18,545	\$0.04
Other Charges	\$34,818	\$0.09	\$39,493	\$0.09
Incarceration	\$11,358,439	\$28.04	\$12,516,489	\$28.63
Salaries	\$8,407,921	\$20.74	\$9,034,219	\$20.67
OT Comp.	\$10,530	\$0.03	\$59,181	\$0.14
Benefits	\$1,452,918	\$3.59	\$1,487,091	\$3.40
Travel	\$5,412	\$0.01	\$14,322	\$0.03
Maintenance	\$37,496	\$0.09	\$36,720	\$0.08
Rent	\$103,905	\$0.26	\$100,851	\$0.23
Communications			\$0	\$0.00
Utilities	\$60	\$0.00	\$0	\$0.00
Other Operations	\$24,736	\$0.06	\$17,740	\$0.04
Supplies	\$1,230,539	\$3.04	\$1,556,148	\$3.56
Professional Services	\$3,423	\$0.01	\$6,470	\$0.01
Capital Outlay	\$71,104	\$0.18	\$169,207	\$0.39
Major Repairs	\$10,255	\$0.03	\$30,160	\$0.07
Other Charges	\$140	\$0.00	\$4,380	\$0.01
Rehabilitation	\$153,954	\$0.38	\$159,394	\$0.36
Health	\$1,356,178	\$3.35	\$1,583,854	\$3.62
Total	\$15,008,019	\$37.05	\$15,398,938	\$35.22
# of Inmates	1,110		1,198	
Total Staff	387		409	
Inmates/Staff	2.87		2.93	
Incarceration Staff	345		364	
Inmates/Inc. Staff	3.22		3.29	

Avoyelles

	Actual 97-98	Avg. Cost/Day	Actual 98-99	Avg. Cost/Day
Administration	\$1,744,128	\$3.23	\$1,210,347	\$2.16
Salaries	\$495,448	\$0.91	\$491,674	\$0.88
Other Compensation				
Benefits	\$87,213	\$0.16	\$88,516	\$0.16
Travel	\$2,733	\$0.01	\$2,227	\$0.00
Maintenance				
Communications	\$25,319	\$0.05	\$25,874	\$0.05
Utilities	\$575,244	\$1.06	\$542,540	\$0.97
Other Operations	\$516,817	\$0.96	\$23,249	\$0.04
Supplies	\$13,752	\$0.03	\$5,189	\$0.01
Capital Outlay			\$297	\$0.00
Major Repair				
Other Charges	\$27,602	\$0.05	\$30,781	\$0.05
Incarceration	\$10,531,532	\$19.51	\$11,371,151	\$20.26
Salaries	\$7,166,042	\$13.28	\$7,760,074	\$13.83
OT Comp.	\$30,846	\$0.06	\$36,667	\$0.07
Benefits	\$1,212,980	\$2.25	\$1,253,814	\$2.23
Travel	\$7,509	\$0.01	\$11,027	\$0.02
Maintenance	\$73,219	\$0.14	\$64,413	\$0.11
Rent	\$101,987	\$0.19	\$101,687	\$0.18
Communications	\$458	\$0.00	\$0	\$0.00
Utilities	\$360	\$0.00	\$210	\$0.00
Other Operations	\$13,138	\$0.02	\$14,505	\$0.03
Supplies	\$1,869,589	\$3.46	\$2,025,097	\$3.61
Professional Services	\$1,389	\$0.00	\$0	\$0.00
Capital Outlay	\$33,983	\$0.06	\$103,657	\$0.18
Major Repairs	\$20,032	\$0.04		
Rehabilitation	\$152,755	\$0.28	\$153,461	\$0.27
Health	\$1,757,998	\$3.26	\$1,810,008	\$3.22
Total	\$14,186,413	\$26.28	\$14,544,967	\$25.91
# of Inmates	1,479		1,538	
Total Staff	387		391	
Inmates/Staff	3.82		3.93	
Incarceration Staff	334		341	
Inmates/Inc. Staff	4.43		4.51	

Phelps

	Actual 97-98	Avg. Cost/Day	Actual 98-99	Avg. Cost/Day
Administration	\$1,482,737	\$5.17	\$1,103,974	\$3.73
Salaries	\$400,598	\$1.40	\$414,057	\$1.41
Other Compensation	\$27,578	\$0.10	\$38,305	\$0.13
Benefits	\$77,650	\$0.27	\$76,884	\$0.26
Travel	\$3,739	\$0.01	\$2,640	\$0.01
Maintenance	\$8,171	\$0.03	\$14,040	\$0.05
Communications	\$47,858	\$0.17	\$48,935	\$0.17
Utilities	\$411,793	\$1.44	\$418,307	\$1.42
Other Operations	\$427,630	\$1.49	\$23,840	\$0.08
Supplies	\$64,631	\$0.23	\$46,026	\$0.16
Capital Outlay	\$7,706	\$0.03	\$11,741	\$0.04
Major Repair				
Other Charges	\$5,383	\$0.02	\$9,199	\$0.03
Incarceration	\$8,190,338	\$28.55	\$8,918,187	\$30.13
Salaries	\$5,578,964	\$19.45	\$5,816,737	\$19.65
OT Comp.	\$270,968	\$0.94	\$259,512	\$0.88
Benefits	\$918,512	\$3.20	\$962,642	\$3.25
Travel	\$4,627	\$0.02	\$12,374	\$0.04
Maintenance	\$76,519	\$0.27	\$58,461	\$0.20
Rent	\$114,972	\$0.40	\$108,517	\$0.37
Communications			\$360	\$0.00
Utilities	\$360	\$0.00	\$228	\$0.00
Other Operations	\$9,996	\$0.03	\$25,887	\$0.09
Supplies	\$1,069,228	\$3.73	\$1,341,625	\$4.53
Professional Services	\$3,739	\$0.01	\$6,616	\$0.02
Capital Outlay	\$91,559	\$0.32	\$150,518	\$0.51
Major Repairs	\$50,894	\$0.18	\$174,710	\$0.59
Rehabilitation	\$116,811	\$0.41	\$112,598	\$0.38
Health	\$823,993	\$2.87	\$891,134	\$3.01
Total	\$10,613,879	\$37.00	\$11,025,893	\$37.25
# of Inmates	786		811	
Total Staff	261		275	
Inmates/Staff	3.01		2.95	
Incarceration Staff	231		293	
Inmates/Inc. Staff	3.40		2.77	

Allen

	Actual 97-98	Avg. Cost/Day	Actual 98-99	Avg. Cost/Day
State Payments	\$13,444,623	\$25.01	\$14,254,892	\$25.73
Administration	\$173,079	\$0.32	\$100,509	\$0.18
Total	\$13,617,702	\$25.33	\$14,355,401	\$25.91
# of Inmates	1,473		1,518	
Total Staff	325		323	
Inmates/Staff	4.53		4.70	
Incarceration Staff	245		242	
Inmates/Inc. Staff	6.01		6.27	

Winn

	Actual 97-98	Avg. Cost/Day	Actual 98-99	Avg. Cost/Day
State Payments	\$13,888,317	\$25.81	\$14,724,873	\$26.70
Administration	\$157,731	\$0.29	\$176,030	\$0.32
Total	\$14,046,048	\$26.10	\$14,900,903	\$27.02
# of Inmates	1,474		1,511	
Total Staff	353		351	
Inmates/Staff	4.18		4.30	
Incarceration Staff	255		255	
Inmates/Inc. Staff	5.78		5.93	

Work Training Facility-North

	Actual 97-98	Avg. Cost/Day	Actual 98-99	Avg. Cost/Day
Administration	\$694,704	\$3.95	\$556,599	\$3.11
Salaries	\$275,429	\$1.57	\$286,802	\$1.61
Other Compensation	\$0	\$0.00	\$0	\$0.00
Benefits	\$45,847	\$0.26	\$44,592	\$0.25
Travel	\$304	\$0.00	\$701	\$0.00
Maintenance	\$125	\$0.00	\$0	\$0.00
Communications	\$19,356	\$0.11	\$17,791	\$0.10
Utilities	\$170,427	\$0.97	\$179,506	\$1.00
Other Operations	\$163,880	\$0.93	\$14,157	\$0.08
Supplies	\$2,276	\$0.01	\$4,021	\$0.02
Capital Outlay	\$8,799	\$0.05	\$0	\$0.00
Other Charges	\$8,261	\$0.05	\$9,029	\$0.05
Incarceration	\$4,203,021	\$23.89	\$4,359,326	\$24.32
Salaries	\$2,939,158	\$16.70	\$3,092,056	\$17.25
OT Comp.	\$3,021	\$0.02	\$5,047	\$0.03
Benefits	\$497,203	\$2.83	\$502,553	\$2.80
Travel	\$915	\$0.01	\$3,364	\$0.02
Maintenance	\$17,522	\$0.10	\$16,391	\$0.09
Rent	\$38,606	\$0.22	\$49,599	\$0.28
Communications	-\$6	\$0.00	-\$2	\$0.00
Utilities	\$360	\$0.00	\$205	\$0.00
Other Operations	\$13,959	\$0.08	\$26,662	\$0.15
Supplies	\$643,898	\$3.66	\$615,943	\$3.44
Professional Services	\$466	\$0.00	\$857	\$0.00
Other Charges	\$877	\$0.00	\$0	\$0.00
Capital Outlay	\$34,402	\$0.20	\$19,599	\$0.11
Major Repairs	\$12,640	\$0.07	\$27,052	\$0.15
Rehabilitation	\$0	\$0.00	\$0	\$0.00
Health	\$391,341	\$2.22	\$441,899	\$2.47
Total	\$5,289,066	\$30.06	\$5,357,824	\$29.90
# of Inmates	482		491	
Total Staff	140		140	
Inmates/Staff	3.44		3.51	
Incarceration Staff	123		123	
Inmates/Inc. Staff	3.92		3.99	

Swanson

	Actual 97-98	Avg. Cost/Day	Actual 98-99	Avg. Cost/Day
Administration	\$1,346,623	\$8.70	\$1,135,967	\$8.26
Salaries	\$464,929	\$3.00	\$495,428	\$3.61
Other Compensation	\$5,964	\$0.04	\$19,200	\$0.14
Benefits	\$69,059	\$0.45	\$74,936	\$0.54
Travel	\$5,394	\$0.03	\$1,464	\$0.01
Maintenance	\$1,657	\$0.01	\$12,727	\$0.09
Communications	\$37,361	\$0.24	\$39,400	\$0.29
Utilities	\$357,390	\$2.32	\$349,790	\$2.54
Other Operations	\$304,257	\$1.97	\$12,176	\$0.09
Supplies	\$39,107	\$0.25	\$62,872	\$0.46
Capital Outlay	\$6,954	\$0.04	\$10,208	\$0.07
Other Charges	\$54,551	\$0.35	\$57,766	\$0.42
Incarceration	\$6,472,456	\$41.82	\$7,039,379	\$51.16
Salaries	\$4,515,776	\$29.18	\$4,860,611	\$35.33
OT Comp.	\$126,230	\$0.82	\$259,930	\$1.89
Benefits	\$659,704	\$4.26	\$733,486	\$5.34
Travel	\$5,922	\$0.04	\$5,989	\$0.04
Maintenance	\$97,043	\$0.63	\$96,874	\$0.70
Rent	\$2,024	\$0.01	\$9,972	\$0.07
Communications				
Utilities	\$360	\$0.00	\$217	\$0.00
Other Operations	\$1,839	\$0.01	\$1,699	\$0.01
Supplies	\$965,856	\$6.24	\$937,101	\$6.82
Professional Services			\$471	\$0.00
Capital Outlay	\$50,554	\$0.33	\$96,695	\$0.70
Major Repairs	\$47,148	\$0.30	\$36,334	\$0.26
Rehabilitation	\$1,541,080	\$9.96	\$1,807,048	\$13.13
Health	\$1,579,085	\$10.20	\$1,684,164	\$12.24
Total	\$10,939,244	\$70.68	\$11,666,558	\$84.79
# of Offenders	424		377	
Total Staff	298		321	
Offenders/Staff	1.42		1.17	
Offenders/Correctional Officers	2.50		2.28	

Bridge City

	Actual 97-98	Avg. Cost/Day	Actual 98-99	Avg. Cost/Day
Administration	\$827,997	\$12.89	\$617,649	\$9.73
Salaries	\$304,964	\$4.75	\$299,281	\$4.70
Other Compensation	\$24,592	\$0.38	\$16,946	\$0.27
Benefits	\$46,088	\$0.72	\$51,078	\$0.80
Travel	\$7,962	\$0.12	\$12,436	\$0.20
Maintenance	\$1,457	\$0.02	\$800	\$0.01
Communications	\$20,080	\$0.31	\$19,576	\$0.31
Utilities	\$136,513	\$2.13	\$140,717	\$2.22
Other Operations	\$206,539	\$3.22	\$14,439	\$0.23
Supplies	\$41,752	\$0.65	\$29,839	\$0.47
Capital Outlay	\$26,195	\$0.41	\$21,347	\$0.34
Other Charges	\$11,855	\$0.18	\$11,190	\$0.18
Incarceration	\$3,581,301	\$55.75	\$3,900,567	\$61.42
Salaries	\$2,445,912	\$38.07	\$2,717,491	\$42.79
OT Comp.	\$94,432	\$1.47	\$83,064	\$1.31
Benefits	\$353,912	\$5.51	\$359,862	\$5.67
Travel	\$0	\$0.00		
Maintenance	\$77,596	\$1.21	\$106,862	\$1.68
Rent	\$3,456	\$0.05	\$1,142	\$0.02
Communications			\$71	\$0.00
Utilities	\$360	\$0.01	\$216	\$0.00
Other Operations	\$1,836	\$0.03	\$1,996	\$0.03
Supplies	\$399,120	\$6.21	\$427,984	\$6.74
Professional Services	\$5,761	\$0.09	\$3,164	\$0.05
Capital Outlay	\$74,355	\$1.16	\$109,208	\$1.72
Major Repairs	\$124,561	\$1.94	\$89,507	\$1.41
Rehabilitation	\$587,455	\$9.14	\$671,404	\$10.57
Health	\$686,186	\$10.68	\$693,447	\$10.92
Total	\$5,682,939	\$88.46	\$5,883,067	\$92.64
# of Offenders	176		174	
Total Staff	156		156	
Offenders/Staff	1.13		1.12	
Offenders/Correctional Offenders	1.90		2.0	

Jetson

	Actual 97-98	Avg. Cost/Day	Actual 98-99	Avg. Cost/Day
Administration	\$1,910,925	\$8.28	\$1,017,431	\$4.59
Salaries	\$414,702	\$1.80	\$430,434	\$1.94
Other Compensation	\$10,437	\$0.05	\$24,178	\$0.11
Benefits	\$64,582	\$0.28	\$70,784	\$0.32
Travel	\$4,014	\$0.02	\$5,086	\$0.02
Maintenance	\$10,364	\$0.04	\$10,765	\$0.05
Communications	\$41,689	\$0.18	\$41,317	\$0.19
Utilities	\$301,314	\$1.31	\$265,048	\$1.20
Other Operations	\$919,399	\$3.98	\$28,330	\$0.13
Supplies	\$39,238	\$0.17	\$29,107	\$0.13
Capital Outlay	\$17,134	\$0.07	\$9,726	\$0.04
Other Charges	\$88,052	\$0.38	\$102,656	\$0.46
Incarceration	\$9,508,327	\$41.22	\$10,151,209	\$45.82
Salaries	\$6,468,184	\$28.05	\$7,068,486	\$31.91
OT Comp.	\$145,380	\$0.63	\$209,983	\$0.95
Benefits	\$1,017,752	\$4.41	\$1,087,373	\$4.91
Travel	\$2,687	\$0.01	\$2,647	\$0.01
Maintenance	\$125,587	\$0.54	\$102,014	\$0.46
Rent	\$60,413	\$0.26	\$40,898	\$0.18
Communications				
Utilities	\$74,280	\$0.32	\$79,332	\$0.36
Other Operations	\$30,876	\$0.13	\$14,796	\$0.07
Supplies	\$1,520,657	\$6.59	\$1,243,705	\$5.61
Professional Services	\$6,973	\$0.03	\$2,728	\$0.01
Capital Outlay	\$47,338	\$0.21	\$140,602	\$0.63
Major Repairs	\$8,200	\$0.04	\$110,666	\$0.50
Reception and Other	\$0	\$0	\$47,979	\$0.22
Rehabilitation	\$1,652,092	\$7.16	\$1,877,690	\$8.48
Health	\$3,054,694	\$13.24	\$3,357,731	\$15.15
Total	\$16,126,038	\$69.90	\$16,404,061	\$74.04
# of Offenders	632		607	
Total Staff	407		431	
Offenders/Staff	1.55		1.41	
Offenders/Correctional Officers	2.52		2.48	

Tallulah

	Actual 97-98	Avg. Cost/Day	Actual 98-99	Avg. Cost/Day
State Payments	\$14,865,173	\$70.59	\$13,947,655	\$71.03
Total	\$14,865,173	\$70.59	\$13,947,655	\$71.03
# of Offenders	577		538	
Total Staff	337		338	
Offenders/Staff	1.71		1.59	
Incarceration Staff	236		240	
Offenders/Correctional Offenders	2.44		2.24	

Jena

	Actual 97-98	Avg. Cost/Day	Actual 98-99	Avg. Cost/Day
State Payments	\$0	\$0.00	\$3,451,140	\$70.00
Total	\$0	\$0.00	\$3,451,140	\$70.00
# of Offenders	0		235	
Total Staff	0		168	
Offenders/Staff	0		1.40	
Incarceration Staff	0		128	
Offenders/Correctional Offenders	0		1.84	

Appendix B

Comparison of Costs, Services, and Staffing at Winn, Allen, and Avoyelles

Appendix B: Comparison of Costs, Services, and Staffing at Winn, Allen, and Avoyelles

	Winn Correctional Center	Avoyelles Correctional Center	Allen Correctional Center
Total DOC Operating Expenditures (FY 1998-99)	\$14,900,903	\$14,544,967	\$14,355,401
Louisiana Community and Technical College Expenditures	\$0	\$299,744	\$95,242
Total Expenditures	\$14,900,903	\$14,844,711	\$14,450,643
Average Cost Per Day Per Inmate	\$27.02	\$26.44	\$26.08
Total Inmates	1,511	1,538	1,518
Total Staff	351	391	323
MEDICAL			
Total Costs (FY 1998-99)	\$1,217,937*	\$1,810,008	\$1,372,113*
Average Cost Per Day	\$2.21	\$3.22	\$2.48
Staffing ¹			
Physician	1	2	1
RN	3	7	5
LPN	10 (3 vacant)	8	12
EMT	1	5 ²	No ³
Oral Surgeon	No	1, 22 hours/month	1, once a week
Dentist	1, 2 times a week	1	1, 32 hours/week

*These numbers were furnished by Corporations Corporation of America (for Winn) and by Allen Correctional Center.

¹ Unless otherwise stated, staff positions are full time.

² EMTs are also correctional officers and are counted as sergeants.

³ Some security officers are also EMTs, but there are none staffed in the infirmary.

	Winn Correctional Center	Avoyelles Correctional Center	Allen Correctional Center
Dental Hygienist/Assistant	1	No	1
Radiologist	No	1, 13 hours/month	No
X-Ray Technician	1, once a week, on call	1, 16 hours/week	1, 3 times a week
Pharmacist	Contracted out	1	Contracted out
Pharmacist Technician	No	1	No
Optometrist	1, once a month	1, 16 hours/month	1, once a month
Psychiatrist	1, 2 times a month	1, 14 hours/week	1, 8 hours/week
Psychologist	1, 4 times a week	1, 6 ½ hours/week	1, 10 hours/week
Other	No	1, on-call physician	2 physicians, once a week each
Vacancies	Yes ⁴	Yes ⁵	No, 2 recently filled
Monthly Average Number of Inmates Seen⁶			
Sick Call	512	271	525
Doctor's Call	191 ⁷	1091	663
Dentist On-Site	105	302	350
Dental Off-Site	2	0.4	2
Optometry On-Site	38	59	13
Optometry Off-Site	2	14	7
Off-Site Emergency Care	3	15	10
Specialty Services On-Site	191	102	111
Specialty Services Off-Site	80	289	115
Total Monthly Average Number of Inmates Seen	1,124	2,143	1,796

⁴ 3 LPN positions⁵ EMT position⁶ Monthly average calculated from five months of data (March 1999 – July 1999).⁷ According to a Winn official, a vacancy in the doctor position and the extended vacation of the dentist may explain the low numbers regarding contacts and prescriptions.

	Winn Correctional Center	Avoyelles Correctional Center	Allen Correctional Center
Inmate Contacts			
Number of New Prescriptions	402	1455	569
Number of Refilled Prescriptions	345	1741	1048
Percentage on Psychotropic Medicine	10-15%	10%	6-8%
Facilities			
Infirmiry Ward	10 beds	8 beds ⁸	8 beds
Isolation Cells	3	3	3
REHABILITATION			
DOC/Private Expenditures (FY 1998-99)	\$529,319*	\$153,461	\$810,939*
Technical College (Vo-Tech) Expenditures (FY 1998-99)	0	\$299,744	\$95,242
Total Rehabilitation Expenditures	\$529,319*	\$453,205	\$906,181*
Average Cost per Day	\$0.96	\$0.81	\$1.64
Staffing			
MSWs on Staff (social workers)	2	5	2
Teacher (including Vo-Tech)	11 full-time, 1-part-time instructors	11	8
Chaplain	1	1 full-time and 3 contract	1
Other Rehabilitation Positions	5 unit managers 9 case managers 1 Mental Health Director	1 psychological examiner 1 Classification Manager 5 Classification Officers ⁹	5 Case Managers/Classification Officers 2 Substance Abuse Counselors

⁸ The Warden of Avoyelles said the difference between Winn and Avoyelles is due to different fire marshals.

*These numbers were furnished by Corrections Corporation of America (for Winn) and by Allen Correctional Center.

⁹ One to each housing unit, act as a unit manager ("go-between" for the inmates).

	Winn Correctional Center	Avoyelles Correctional Center	Allen Correctional Center
	1 Mental Health Clinician 1 Substance Abuse Coordinator 1 Pre-release Coordinator 1 Program Manager Total = 19	5 Clinical Social Workers Total = 12	2 Mental Health Specialists 2 Recreational Specialists 1 Classification Supervisor Total = 12
Vacancies	Yes ¹⁰	Yes ¹¹	No
<u>Programs/Participation</u> ¹²			
Pre-release	Yes/87	Yes/32	Yes/37
Substance Abuse	Yes/267	Yes/188	Yes/394
Character Counts	Yes/46	Yes/194	Yes/35
Parenting Skills	Yes/41 ¹³	Yes/50	Yes/35
Sex Offender Program	Yes/13	Yes/64	Yes/38
Individual Mental Health Contacts	292	652	298
Anger Management	Yes	Yes	Yes
AA	Yes	Yes	Yes
NA	Yes	Yes	Yes
HIV Counseling	Yes	Yes	Yes
Other	Yes ¹⁴	Yes ¹⁵	Yes ¹⁶
Social Programs Backlog	Yes	Yes	No
Religious Services	Yes	Yes	Yes

¹⁰ 1- Computer Teacher; the Chaplain is currently teaching the class.

¹¹ Clerical position for Project Metamorphosis, Psychological Examiner, 3 MSWs

¹² Participation is calculated from an average of five months' data (March - July 1999).

¹³ Part of Pre-release Program

¹⁴ Sexual Addicts Anonymous and Medication Management Group

¹⁵ Bereavement Support Group, Smoking Cessation

¹⁶ Stress Management, Crimeholics, Errors in Thinking

	Winn Correctional Center	Avoyelles Correctional Center	Allen Correctional Center
ABE/GED Slots Available	150	130	200
ABE/GED Slots Filled	130	105	134
% of Class Filled	87%	81%	67%
Vo-Tech Programs			
Culinary Arts	Yes	Yes	Yes
Slots Available	50	40	40
Slots Filled	38	34	34
Computerized Office	Yes ¹⁷	No	Yes
Slots Available	27		20
Slots Filled	19		19
Auto Body Repair	Yes	Yes	No
Slots Available	20	20	
Slots Filled	18	16	
Upholstery	No	No	Yes
Slots Available			20
Slots Filled			14
Horticulture	Yes	Yes	No
Slots Available	20	15	
Slots Filled	18	15	
Data Entry	Yes	No	No
Slots Available	20		
Slots Filled	17		
HV&AC¹⁸	Yes	No	No
Slots Available	25		
Slots Filled	23		

¹⁷ Computer Information Processing¹⁸ Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning

	Winn Correctional Center	Avoyelles Correctional Center	Allen Correctional Center
Printing	Yes	No	No
Slots Available	12		
Slots Filled	11		
Basic Automotive	Yes	Yes	No
Slots Available	5	20	
Slots Filled	5	16	
Cabinet Making	No	No	Yes
Slots Available			20
Slots Filled			14
Janitorial & Sanitation	Yes	No	No
Slots Available	25		
Slots Filled	19		
Job Skills Education Program	No	Yes	No
Slots Available		69	
Slots Filled		67	
Project Metamorphosis	Yes ¹⁹	Yes	No
Slots Available	180 ²⁰	200 ²¹	
Slots Filled	195	182	
Total Vo-Tech Slots Available	384	364	100
Total Vo-Tech Slots Filled	363	330	81
% of Slots Filled	95%	91%	81%
Education Backlogs	Yes	Yes ²²	Yes ²³

¹⁹ Taught in the education/vo-tech classes

²⁰ According to Warden Hubert, the program began in June 1999 and the number of participants exceeded the slots available.

²¹ The grant for Project Metamorphosis mandates a minimum of 200 inmates to be served. However, available slots do exceed this minimum.

²² Literacy program only

²³ Four percent of inmate population is on waiting list for education programs.

	Winn Correctional Center	Avozelles Correctional Center	Allen Correctional Center
PHYSICAL PLANT			
Age of Facility	9 years	10 years	9 years
Opened	Feb-1990	1989	Dec-1990
Total Cost to Date	\$33,901,006	\$36,218,769 ²⁴	\$33,120,832
Current Inmate Capacity	1538	1538	1538
Acreage	1200	1187	1000
Number of Maintenance Staff	7 ²⁵	8	7
Metal Detector at Front Entrance	Yes	No	Yes
Other Buildings Unique to Facility		Physical Fitness Building for Employees in Progress	Count room in Education Building

²⁴ The cost to date for Avozelles is significantly higher than Allen and Winn since Avozelles was constructed first and includes the original design fee.

²⁵ Two positions are listed as security positions.

SECURITY	Winn Correctional Center	Avoyelles Correctional Center	Allen Correctional Center
Total Security Costs (FY 1998-99)	\$7,497,690*	\$11,371,151	\$7,689,841*
Total Number of Inmates (FY 1998-99)	1,511	1,538	1,518
Average Cost Per Day	\$13.59	\$20.26	\$13.88
Number of Total Incarceration Staff**	255	321	242
Inmate to Incarceration Staff Ratio	5.91	4.79	6.26
Vacancies	No, 15 recently filled	1	No, 18 recently filled
Annual Turnover Rate	38%	30%	70%
Inmate on Inmate Assaults	10	26	15
Inmate on Staff Assaults ²⁶	3	1	3
Escapes ²⁷	1	1	2
Apprehensions ²⁸	1	1	2
Correctional Officers Carry Beepers ²⁹	No	Yes	No
Security for Hospitalized Inmates	Yes - 1 st 48 hours and then state must pay.	Yes	Yes - 1 st 48 hours and then state must pay.

*These numbers were furnished by Corrections Corporation of America (for Winn) and by Allen Correctional Center.

**The staff figures reported for Winn and Allen represent total incarceration staff. The figure for Avoyelles represents security officers only.

²⁶ Calculation based on five-month average from March 1999 to July 1999.

²⁷ Escapes are totals, not averages for the five-month period.

²⁸ Apprehensions are totals, not averages for the five-month period.

²⁹ Officers at private prisons do not carry beepers, but they do carry radios.

Appendix C

A List of Sheriffs and Local Facilities Receiving and Responding to Cost Template Mailouts

Appendix C: A List of Sheriffs and Local Facilities Receiving and Responding to Cost Template Mailouts

This appendix contains a list of the sheriffs and local jails on our cost template mailing list. We mailed letters to those listed below. The letter contained a cost template to be completed by each sheriff and correctional facility. This appendix also contains a list of those who responded to our letter.

<u>Sheriff</u>	<u>Name of Facility</u>
1. William O. Belt	Avoyelles Bunkie Detention Avoyelles Bordelonville Detention Center Avoyelles Marksville Detention Center Avoyelles Simmsport Detention Center Avoyelles Women's Correctional Center
2. Charles B. Thompson	Caldwell Correctional Center Caldwell Parish Detention Center Caldwell Parish Jail
3. William Earl Hilton	Rapides Parish Detention Center Rapides Parish Female Detention Center Rapides Parish Detention Center III
4. Mark Shumante	East Carroll Parish Jail East Carroll Parish River Bend Detention Center
5. Randy Maxwell	Concordia Parish Jail Concordia Parish Correctional Facility
6. Larry G. Cox	Madison Parish Jail Madison Parish Detention Center

7. Charles Cook
Ouachita Parish Correctional Center
Ouachita Parish Jail
8. Craig Webre
Lafourche Parish Jail
Lafourche Detention Center
9. Bob Carter
Morehouse Parish Correctional Center and Annex
Morehouse Parish Detention Center
10. Guffey Lynn Pattison
Sabine Parish Jail
Sabine Parish Detention Center
11. Larkin T. Riser
Webster Parish Jail
12. Hugh Bennet, Jr.
DeSoto Parish Law Enforcement and Detention Center
13. Charles A. Fuselier
St. Martin Parish Correctional Center
14. Frank A. Howard
Vernon Parish Jail
15. Wayne Jones
St. John the Baptist Parish Prison
16. Gary K. Bennett
West Carroll Parish Jail
17. Larry C. Deen
Bossier Parish Jail
18. Wayne Houck
Lincoln Parish Detention Center
19. Robert Buckley
Union Parish Detention Center
20. E. "Buddy" Jordan
Winn Parish Jail
21. Wayne Morein
Evangeline Parish Jail
22. W.M. "Bill" Daniel
West Feliciana Parish Detention Center
23. Van Beasley
Jackson Parish Correctional Center
24. Donald J. Breaux
Lafayette Parish Correctional Center

25.	Kenneth Volentine	Claiborne Parish Jail
26.	L. R. "Pop" Hataway	Grant Parish Jail
27.	James R. Savoie	Cameron Parish Jail
28.	Steve Pylant	Franklin Parish Detention Center
29.	Harry Lee	Jefferson Parish Prison
30.	Sid Hebert	Iberia Parish Criminal Justice Facility
31.	Don Hathaway	Caddo Parish Correctional Center
32.	Jeffrey F. Wiley	Ascension Parish Jail
33.	Freddie Pitre, Sr.	Iberville Parish Detention Center
34.	Dennis Warwick	LaSalle Parish Correctional Center
35.	Thomas Mabile	Assumption Parish Jail
36.	Wayne McElveen	Calcasieu Parish Correctional Center
37.	Boyd Durr	Natchitoches Parish Detention Center
38.	Charles C. Foti	Orleans Parish Prison
39.	I. F. "Jiff" Hingle	Plaquemines Parish Detention Center and Annexes
40.	Paul Raymond Smith	Pointe Coupee Parish Detention Center
41.	Lorell Graham	Richland Parish Center Detention
42.	Jack A. Stephens	St. Bernard Parish Prison and Annex
43.	Richard Edwards, Jr.	Jefferson Davis Parish Correctional Center
44.	Edward Layrisson	Tangipahoa Parish Jail
45.	Randall J. Andre	West Baton Rouge Parish Jail
46.	Mike McDonald	Tensas Parish Detention Center

47.	Ronald Ficklin	St. Helena Parish Jail
48.	Willy J. Martin	St. James Parish Detention Center
49.	Jerry J. Larpenter	Terrebonne Parish C. J. Complex and Annex
50.	Ray Lemaire	Vermilion Parish Correctional Center
51.	Howard Zerangue	St. Landry Parish Jail
52.	Willie Graves	Livingston Parish Jail
53.	Duane Blair	Washington Parish Jail
54.	David A. Naquin	St. Mary Parish Jail
55.	Rodney Strain, Jr.	St. Tammany Parish Jail
56.	T. R. Maglone	East Feliciana Parish
57.	Buddy Huckabay	Red River Parish Jail
58.	Gregory C. Champagne	St. Charles Parish Correctional Center
59.	Kenneth Goss	Acadia Parish Correctional Facility
60.	Harold Turner	Allen Parish Jail
61.	Bolivar Bishop	Beauregard Parish Jail Complex
62.	Joe Storey	Bienville Parish Jail
63.	Ronnie Book	Catahoula Parish Jail
64.	Elmer Litchfield	East Baton Rouge Parish Prison

We also mailed letters to jails not managed by sheriffs. They are as follows:

<u>Name, Position/Title</u>	<u>Name of Facility</u>
1. Dalton R. Joseph, Warden	Jennings Police Department
2. Ben G. Adams, Warden	Jonesville City Jail
3. Charles B. Manuel, Chief of Police	Eunice Police Department
4. Bill Landry, Chief of Police	Gonzales City Jail
5. Adam Fruge (A.P.V.)	Mamou City Jail
6. Bennie Raynor, Chief of Police	Pearl River City Jail
7. Ben Morris, Chief of Police	Slidell Police Department
8. Parker Gibson, Chief of Police	Amite City Jail
9. Allen Ivory, Chief of Police	Basile City Jail
10. Gary P. Copes, Warden	South Louisiana Correctional Center
11. Larry Laborde, Chief of Police	West Monroe Police Department
12. T. Joseph Andrus, Chief of Police	Sulphur Police Department
13. George Melancon, Chief of Police	Rayne Police Department
14. L. A. "Buddy" Henagan, Mayor	Office of the Mayor, City of Dequincy
15. Kenneth Weave, Warden	Bossier Parish Penal Farm
16. David Jones, Mayor	West Carroll Detention Center
17. Dennis Brouillard, Chief of Police	Vinton City Jail
18. Edward C. Knight, Warden	East Carroll Parish Prison Farm

We received responses from 20 recipients of the cost templates, which are as follows:

<u>Name, Position/Title</u>	<u>Name of Facility/Parish</u>
1. Jeffrey F. Wiley, Sheriff	Ascension Parish Jail
2. William O. Belt, Sheriff	Avoyelles Bordelonville Correctional Center
3. Bolivar Bishop, Sheriff	Beauregard Parish Jail Complex
4. Elmer Litchfield, Sheriff	East Baton Rouge Parish Prison
5. Van Beasley, Sheriff	Jackson Parish Correctional Center
6. Mark Shumante, Sheriff	East Carroll Parish
7. Bennie Raynor, Chief of Police	Pearl River City Jail
8. Joy Fontenot, City Clerk	Office of the Mayor, City of Dequincy
9. Chuck James, Superintendent	Lincoln Parish Detention Center
10. George Melancon, Chief of Police	Rayne Police Department
11. Gary Fontenot, Chief of Police	Eunice Police Department
12. Ben G. Adams, Warden	Jonesville City Jail
13. Jacqueline M. Blank, Records Clerk	Jennings Police Department
14. Larry Laborde, Chief of Police	West Monroe Police Department
15. Bill Landry, Chief of Police	Gonzales City Jail
16. Bradley N. Cammack, CPA, Treasurer	Ouachita Parish Correctional Center
17. Elisha Matthews, Secretary-Treasurer	East Carroll Parish Prison Farm
18. Union Parish Police Jury	Union Parish Detention Center
19. Emerald Correctional Management	West Carroll Detention Center
20. Richard Harbison, Business Manager	South Louisiana Correctional Center

Appendix D

Department of Public Safety
and Corrections,
Corrections Services' Response

DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONS



M. J. "MIKE" FOSTER, JR., GOVERNOR

RICHARD L. STALDER, SECRETARY

February 29, 2000

RECEIVED
LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR
2000 FEB 29 PM 3:49

Daniel G. Kyle, PH.D., CPA, CFE
Office of Legislative Auditor
Post Office Box 94397
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-9397

Dear Dr. Kyle:

In reference to your performance audit report on Adult and Juvenile Correctional Facilities in Louisiana submitted on February 7, 2000, the Department's response, outlined by chapter, is as follows:

Chapter 3: Analysis of State Correctional Facility Costs

The report recommends inclusion of Headquarter's administrative costs and inclusion of capital costs such as depreciation costs of the facility and any interest incurred on debt to finance the facility's construction in reporting operating costs.

The department does not concur with the inclusion of these costs for the following reasons:

- Inclusion of Headquarter's administrative costs at the institutional level can only be accomplished through an allocation process. Even the best allocation methods tend to allocate costs unevenly to lower operating units which makes analysis of operations more difficult. Because of this, the department feels as though this would tend to misrepresent its costs and would ultimately provide less meaningful information to decision makers.
- Inclusion of capital costs such as depreciation is inconsistent with current generally accepted accounting principles for general operating appropriation funds. Additionally, cost of interest incurred on debt to finance facility construction is not normally reported with operating expenditures. In our opinion, inclusion of these costs tend to distort the reporting of operating costs of the units.

Chapter Four: Comparison of State (Privately and Publicly Operated) Adult Correctional Facilities

The report concludes on page 69 that the private facilities have fewer security officers and that this is a major reason that their incarceration costs are lower. The conclusion is based on the number of correctional officers reported by Corrections Corporation of America and Wackenhut.

The department feels that this comparison, based solely on the reported number of officers, is skewed due to the differences in employee classifications. If more detailed analysis was conducted, the department is certain that it has security officers performing many legitimate security functions at the units such as supervising warehouse, mailroom, and canteen operations which are not classified as correctional security officer positions at the private facilities. Without additional analysis, any comparison other than on the total number of positions is of little value.

In reference to the conclusion on page 72 that building a new prison might yield cost savings to the State over the long term, it is true that facility design has a major impact on the cost to staff a prison as previously indicated. Another item that significantly drives cost is the career aging of staff. This helps explain the variance noted between Avoyelles and Washington Correctional Center, which is older and experiences a lower rate of employee turnover than other units. This variance would diminish over time as the new employees gain seniority.

Chapter Five: Housing of State Inmates in Local Facilities.

In Chapter 5, the report attempts to paint Louisiana as a clear exception relative to other states in the housing of state inmates in local facilities.

It must be noted that the housing of state inmates in local facilities is a legitimate outsourcing of correctional services that accomplishes:

- A significant reduction in the state's need to capitalize correctional facilities, (a savings currently estimated at \$430,000,000 utilizing the legislative auditor's estimated cost per bed as stated in the report).
- A significant reduction in the number of state employees, (a savings currently estimated to be 5,000 positions).
- A significant reduction in operational costs (a savings currently estimated to be \$69,000,000 per year).

Performance Audit Response

February 29, 2000

Page 3

This type of outsourcing is a common practice among many jurisdictions. It is reflected in partnerships with private for-profit companies and transfers of inmates out-of-state as well as partnerships with local governments. For example:

- a. Washington DC is eliminating its entire long-term correctional housing capability and currently has inmates located around the country outsourced to private, state and federal facilities.
- b. Wayne Scott, Director of the Texas Department of Corrections, advises that he currently has almost 4000 inmates permanently housed in local facilities, that this number will increase by 125% in the next 2 years, and that he supports this alternative and expects significant further utilization of local beds (built in many cases with state financial support), for the housing of state inmates.
- c. Mississippi houses state inmates in local facilities permanently in six joint county regional facilities, (which are defined as local facilities housing state or local inmates with a per diem paid to counties or sheriffs). Mississippi's current strategy to increase beds available to house state inmates is to partner with local government, support the construction of local facilities, and permanently house state inmates in those facilities.
- d. The Utah Department of Corrections has utilized local jails to permanently house state inmates since 1986. The February/March 1998 edition of the "Corrections Managers' Report," includes an article relative to this concept (which we attached as a formal part of this response), because it speaks directly to the benefits realized by all parties when states work with local governments to house inmates. These benefits are identified by the Utah D.O.C. to include:
 - Income generated stays in the system and is used to retire construction bond costs and to augment jail budgets, rather than to pay stockholders in private companies.
 - Significant economic benefit to the counties.
 - State pays nothing to build new beds.
 - State saves on operating costs.
 - Counties are able to build larger, more economical and efficient jails.
 - Taxpayers win, because it is more cost effective.

The department agrees that it would be in the State's best interest to expand the limited amount of sampling that is being performed. The department requested an additional position to assist in this regard in the Fiscal Year 2000-2001 budget request. It was not funded, however, due to the financial problems of the State.

Chapter Six: Rehabilitation and Recidivism

Exhibit 6-3 presents the percentage of inmates enrolled in rehabilitation programs, Louisiana versus other states in the Southern Legislative Conference for Fiscal Year 1998-99. As noted in the chart, Louisiana spends only .7% of its budget on rehabilitation programs. What is not noted however, is the fact that:

- Other states in the conference spend on average 4.24%, or 500% more of their budget in Rehabilitation than does Louisiana based on the percentages given.
- Other states in the conference have 3.81% of their inmates versus 2.67% for Louisiana, or only 42.7% more inmates receiving GEDs.
- Other states in the conference have 8.97% of their inmates versus 8.44% for Louisiana, or only 6.3% more enrolled in literacy programs.

This illustrates the fact that Louisiana is very efficient with the small amount of resources which are allocated to these programs.

If you have any questions regarding this response, please feel free to give me a call.

Sincerely,



Bernard E. "Trey" Boudreaux, III
Undersecretary

BEB:RLG:rlg

c: Secretary Stalder

Attachments

CORRECTIONS MANAGERS' Report®

Volume III, No. 5
February/March 1998
ISSN 1083-3382

MANAGEMENT • OPERATIONS • FINANCE • LAW AND GOVERNMENT REGULATION • HUMAN RESOURCES

Can Private Jails Survive *Richardson v. McKnight*?

by Frank D. Mylar

Of the plethora of Supreme Court decisions rendered in June 1997, one case should be mandatory reading for all managers of private correctional facilities: *Richardson v. McKnight*, 117 S.Ct. 2100 (1997). Unless government institutions agree to indemnify and defend suits filed against private facilities, only private companies need concern themselves with this case, although the private sector may pass along the resulting increased liability costs. The *Richardson* Court ruled that private prison employees may not assert the defense of qualified immunity. Private prisons may now be held liable for monetary damages even in the absence of previous court decisions declaring the relevant conduct unconstitutional. The net effect of this ruling is that private facilities must now seek greater and ongoing legal review of all aspects of corrections operations to avoid liability stemming from unanticipated changes in law.

What If Private Employee Is Taking State Action?

The Court's decision in *Richardson* did not conclude that all privately employed corrections employees will always be denied this important defense. The Court partially based its decision upon the fact that employees of a private prison corporation in Tennessee (South Central Correctional Center) performed their jobs "without government supervision or direction." Presumably, the Court might have reached a different conclusion if the state supervised and/or mandated cer-

See *PRIVATE JAILS*, page 4

Budget Stretchers

Jail Contracting: Utah's New Twist in 'Privatized' Corrections

by Gary W. DeLand

Fact: Under the best of circumstances, jails are expensive to construct and operate. **Fact:** Small facilities cannot achieve the same economy-of-scale benefits available to large facilities; especially, in prisoner-to-staff ratios and purchasing of food and other supplies. **Fact:** Utah counties are statutorily obligated to provide county jails to house pretrial and sentenced prisoners. **Fact:** Utah has 29 counties, of which only four have large enough average daily populations of county prisoners to realize economies of scale. **Fact:** With the growth of prison populations, housing state prisoners has become a much more expensive problem. **Fact:** Private corrections systems if managed moderately well will generate profits for stockholders.

Approximately 85% of Utah's population is located in a narrow, 100-mile long stretch following Interstate 15 along the west side of the Wasatch Mountains, in the four so-called Wasatch Front counties (Salt Lake, Weber, Utah, and Davis). The remaining 15% percent of the population is scattered among the remaining 25 counties. Most of the remaining counties are

geographically large, have low population densities, are rural, and are somewhat isolated from other counties. These counties, like other small counties across the United States, have found it very difficult to fund full-service jails which both meet constitutional mandates and fit within the counties' funding capabilities. For the past several years many of the state's county sheriffs have been involved in an unique cooperative venture with the Utah Department of Corrections (UDC) which takes into account the series of facts listed as a preface to this article and the unique nature of Utah's population distribution.

A Multimillion Dollar Facility-Building Program for Many Counties

Although Utah county jails have housed state prisoners for various reasons for several decades, such housing was of a very limited nature. However, in 1986, shortly after I was named as Executive Director for the UDC, I was approached by San

See *UTAH*, next page

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE

PLRA: Make the Most of the "Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies" Requirement	3
Take Steps to Avoid Staff Problems With Latex Allergies	5
Using Multimedia Technologies for Correctional Staff Training	6
Avoiding the Deadly Sins of Leadership (Part I): Don't Fail to Manage Yourself	7
What's in a Name? Selecting Your Address in Cyberspace	8
How to Make Performance Evaluations an Effective Management Tool	10
From the Literature	11

Budget Stretchers: A New CMR Feature

Many jurisdictions have developed unique ways to fund corrections operations and programs. Some have been able to achieve cost-free programs, and others—such as the Utah example reported in this issue—have even found ways to generate revenue. With this article, CMR introduces a new periodic feature, which will highlight innovative income generating or no-cost corrections programs and ideas.

If you have developed an innovative "budget stretcher" program you'd like us to consider, write to Gary DeLand, Corrections Managers' Report, P.O. Box 579, Santa Clara, UT 84765. ■

UTAH, from page 1

Juan County Sheriff Rigby Wright. San Juan County is one of the nation's largest, but least populated, counties. Sheriff Wright needed to replace an old and terribly inadequate jail, and had become painfully aware of the economic disadvantage of constructing and operating a jail of the very small size necessary to meet the county's projected prisoner population needs. Sheriff Wright proposed a solution to his problem: He would build a jail 50 or 60 beds larger than his projected need, and then rent the extra beds to the state. He anticipated generating at least \$500,000 of revenue, which would help the his county retire construction bond payments and defray staffing and other operational costs.

I accepted his offer and the seeds were planted for the current Utah jail contracting program—an ongoing win-win cooperative effort between the UDC and the State's participating counties. In a little over a decade, the program has steadily grown, and in 1998 will include 17 of the

29 Utah counties. Ironically, a couple of years after I retired from the UDC in 1991, I was named Executive Director for the Utah Sheriffs' Association, and now oversee the program from the county side. The program's success has resulted in an expansion from the few hundred thousand dollars transferred to the counties in the first year or two of the program, to the current fiscal year budgeted at \$7,251,248, and a proposed UDC budget for the coming fiscal year requests an increase to \$11,687,048.

Money Stays in the System

What is "jail contracting," who benefits, and how are the benefits derived?

Quite simply, jail contracting is a program which allows the UDC and individual counties to enter into mutually beneficial agreements in which the counties are financially compensated to construct cells and house UDC prisoners. It is no secret that private corrections is a rapidly growing enterprise, and that well-managed firms are able to provide competitive per diem rates while gener-

ating substantial annual profits. The Utah jail contracting program functions in a manner similar to that employed by private vendors, except that the income generated stays in the system and is used to retire the construction bond costs and to augment jail budgets, rather than to pay stockholders in private companies.

Significant Economic Benefits to the Counties

Contracting allows smaller counties to achieve economies of scale, ordinarily not possible in small facilities, and to build for their projected future needs without currently saddling the county with vacant beds.

The counties must provide space to house pretrial detainees arrested by county, city, and state peace officers and awaiting trial. In addition, the jails must house sentenced misdemeanants and 400-500 convicted felons whose prison sentences were stayed by placing them on a probation which includes jail incarceration; generally, incarceration of several months. To house these prisoners, counties must operate full-service jail facilities. Staff costs are the main expense in operating a jail, and it takes about the same amount of staff to run a 50-bed, 100-bed, or 150-bed jail. To overcome this economic disadvantage, the smaller jails build their new jails substantially larger than their current local needs, thus increasing the number of persons housed in the facility to levels which optimize staffing efficiency.

The result has been significant reduction in costs.
See UTAH, page 13

Corrections Managers' Report®

Editor: Gary W. DeLand

Editorial Director: Felicia A. Rosenfeld, Esq.

Assistant Editor: Nannette L. Johnson

Publisher: Arthur H. Rosenfeld, Esq.

Associate Publisher: Mark E. Peel

Managing Editor: Deborah J. Launer

Contributing Editor: Richard G. Kieckbusch, Ph.D.

Editorial Board

George M. Camp - Principal, Criminal Justice Institute, Co-editor, *The Corrections Yearbook*, former Director, Missouri Department of Corrections.

Fred Cohen - Professor Emeritus, Graduate School of Criminal Justice, State University of New York, Albany. Author of *Legal Rights of Mentally Disabled Prison Inmates*; Co-Editor of *Correctional Law Reporter* and *Community Corrections Report*.

William C. Collins, Esq. - Attorney specializing in corrections, former Senior Assistant Attorney General for the State of Washington, Co-editor of *Correctional Law Reporter* and *Community Corrections Report*.

Dr. Jack Enter - Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice, North Georgia College, former Program Director, Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (Georgia), instructor, International Chiefs of Police Association.

Michael W. Haley - Ed.D., Director of Jail Services, Alabama Sheriff's Association.

Michael P. Hodge, Esq. - Employee Litigation Director, Texas Department of Criminal Justice

Jake Katz - Custody Management Specialist, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office, former Technical Assistance Manager, National Institute of Corrections Jail Center, former Bureau Chief, New Mexico Standards and Inspections Bureau.

Aaron Kennard - Sheriff, Salt Lake County (Utah); Sergeant-at-Arms, National Sheriffs' Association; President, Utah Sheriffs' Association.

O. Lane McCotter - Executive Director, Utah Department of Corrections, former Director, New Mexico Department of Corrections, former Director of Institutions, Texas Department of Corrections.

Bonnie Norman - Medical Consultant, former Director of Medical Services, Los Angeles County Jail.

Dr. Stephen J. Sampson - Chief Psychologist, Georgia Regional Hospital, President, Communication Skills Institute, Inc., Lawrenceville, Georgia, Assistant Professor, Criminal Justice Department, Georgia State University.

Corrections Managers' Report (ISSN 1083-3382) is published bimonthly by Civic Research Institute, Inc., 4490 U.S. Route 27, P.O. Box 585, Kingston, NJ 08528. Periodicals postage paid at Kingston, NJ and at additional mailing offices. Subscriptions: \$125 per year in the United States and Canada, \$30 additional per year elsewhere. Vol. 11, No. 5, February/March 1998. Copyright 1998 by Civic Research Institute, Inc. All rights reserved. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to Civic Research Institute, Inc., P.O. Box 585, Kingston, NJ 08528. *Corrections Managers' Report* is a registered trademark owned by Civic Research Institute, Inc. and may not be used without express permission.

The information in this publication is not intended to replace the services of a trained legal or health professional. Neither the editor, nor the contributors, nor Civic Research Institute, Inc. is engaged in rendering legal, psychological, health or other professional services. The editors, the contributors and Civic Research Institute, Inc. specifically disclaim any liability, loss or risk, personal or otherwise, which is incurred as a consequence, directly or indirectly, of the use and application of any of the contents of this publication.

UTAH, from page 2

tions in the counties' per-prisoner operational costs. Contracting allows smaller counties to sell beds to provide a revenue stream to retire the building bond, off-set operational costs, and fill vacant beds. A county which needs only 35 beds for its own prisoners can take another 150 from the state and generate revenue—just as a private jail or prison does. The counties generally have more flexible purchasing requirements, and are not burdened by many of the expensive policies and regulations faced by state agencies such as the UDC.

Significant Economic Benefits to the State

State Pays Nothing to Build New Beds. Counties take the responsibility for bonding to pay the capital costs of building the facilities that will house the contract state prisoners. During the past fiscal year, Utah contracted for 382 jail beds, and the coming year, under the proposed budget, will raise that total to 843 as newly constructed jail cells come on line as a result of jail construction in Box Elder, Summit, Washington, Beaver, and Millard counties.

At an estimated construction cost of \$50,000 per bed, the state would have to spend \$40 million to \$45 million to build a new prison to house the prisoners who instead will be sent to contract jails in 1998. By contracting with the counties, however, the cost to the state to plan, design, bond for, and construct the facilities is *absolutely nothing*. Six other Utah counties are currently in the planning process, with Weber and Daggett counties recently passing bond elections for new jails which will add to the total of available jail beds.

State Saves on Operating Costs. The participating counties also take the responsibility for employing and paying for the staff who supervise the contract prisoners, permitting the state to house its contract prisoners without increasing the size of state government. A reasonable estimate of the number of staff that would have to be added to the state payroll to provide supervision and care for 843 prisoners would be about 250. The counties also operate the contract jails far less expensively than the state could. The cost per prisoner at the Utah State Prison is about \$63 per day, while the counties charge the state a \$38 per diem. The state also picks up an additional \$4 or \$5 per day in medical and legal contract costs, bringing the total daily expenditure for the state to \$42 to \$43.

How Contracting Benefits County Taxpayers

The Purgatory (Washington County) Jail—so-named because it is being constructed on Purgatory Flats—will provide a 400-bed jail to replace a poorly designed, undersized, and otherwise inadequate facility. The old jail had a design capacity of 65 and a population of about 100. It was sited in a location which did not permit expansion, and had to serve one of the most rapidly growing counties in the U.S.

The county will need 125 to 150 beds when the new jail opens in early 1998, and will rent the remaining 250 beds to the UDC. At the current contract rate, Washington County will receive over \$3 million in the fiscal year. That amount will retire the construction bond, and make a significant contribution to operational costs. This scenario is being played out to varying degrees in more than half of Utah's counties. ■

Ensuring Quality

The Utah Sheriffs' Association (USA) has recognized the need for its jails to be constitutionally and competently managed. This becomes even more important when inviting several hundred state prisoners to be housed in the jails. The USA developed a comprehensive set of jail standards which provide jail administrators with a myriad individual standards based on statutory and constitutional requirements, pragmatic corrections practices, and the unique realities of operating jails in Utah. The standards provide sheriffs and jail commanders with the rationale for each standard and a discussion of compliance requirements. The standards are well suited to conversion to policies and procedures. In addition, the USA runs an inspection program for the jails. That program is currently being revised to computerize the inspection process. The UDC has adopted the Utah Jail Standards as the benchmark required for the jails with which it contracts. The contract program is monitored by Hazen Locke, Director, of the UDC's Inmate Placement Program (IPP).

All Utah jails are staffed with fully trained and certified corrections officers. Before corrections officers can supervise prisoners, they must undergo a seven-week basic corrections training program. After completion of the basic certification program, they must complete a minimum of 40 hours of advanced corrections training per year. The USA and UDC are confident that the combination of extensive training, comprehensive jail standards, inspection of jails for compliance with the standards, and monitoring of the program by the IPP provides a highly competent system for supervising and managing contract prisoners.

A Win-Win Arrangement

As with any innovation, though mutually beneficial, the program has some

detractors. A few legislators, media types, and others have taken a short-sighted view of the program. Some even complain that the state is subsidizing the county jails. None of those who have expressed the myopic opinion that the counties are somehow taking advantage of the state under the contracting agreements has suggested how the state could afford to build and operate its own facilities, or if it could afford it, how it could achieve the cost savings realized by the state under this system.

Everyone wins with contracting:

- **The state**—can expand its prisoner population without eating up its bonding capacity, entirely avoids construction costs, and adds no new staff to its payroll. The state also has the luxury of contracting at per diem rates of \$20 to \$25 per day per prisoner less than the current rate of housing prisoners in Utah prisons.
- **The counties**—especially the rural counties—are able to build larger, more economical and efficient jails, and have a revenue stream to pay for construction costs and defray facility operations expenses.
- **The taxpayers**—win because both the state and county are able to operate in a more cost-effective manner, while providing the beds needed to house convicted felons.

Utah is a state which is very short of cells. Utah, though viewed from outside as a conservative, law-and-order state, incarcerates only about half the number of convicted persons as the national average and of the other western states. Taking into account both the current and projected cells which will be available to the state in contract jails by the turn of the century, counties will likely be incarcerating over 20% of the UDC's prisoners, with all revenue generated going to county government, rather than for-profit, private prison operators. ■